





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

YEAR BOOK
OF THE
Central Conference
OF
American Rabbis

VOLUME XIX

EDITED BY

JULIAN MORGENSTERN, DAVID LEFKOWITZ
AND DAVID PHILIPSON

YEAR BOOK EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

1909



5670

105011
20/9/10

CONTAINING THE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONVENTION
HELD IN
NEW YORK CITY

NOVEMBER 9 TO 16, 1909

Copyright 1910

BY CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS



BM
30
C4
V. 19

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Officers, 1908-1909	5
Standing Committees, 1908-1909	6
Officers, 1909-1910	9
Standing Committees, 1909-1910	10
Temporary Committees, New York Convention, November 9-16, 1909	14
Program of Convention	16
Address of Welcome, Rabbi Samuel Schulman.....	20
Members in Attendance	25
Report of Corresponding Secretary	29
Report of Recording Secretary	32
Report of Treasurer	35
Report of Publication Committee	44
Report of Finance Committee	58
Report of Committee on Scripture Readings	64
Report of Committee on Contemporaneous History	65
Discussion of Report of Committee on Scripture Readings.....	72
Memorial Address in Honor of Joseph Mayor Asher, Rabbi Maurice H. Harris	74
Report of Committee on Revision of Union Hymnal	76
Report of Committee on Relation of Church and State.....	83
Greetings from the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of New York, and Reply.....	88
Report of Committee on Sermonic Literature	90
Report of Committee on Instruction of Blind, Deaf Mutes, etc....	94
Report of Committee on Lyceum Bureau	104
Report of Committee on Religious Schools	108
Discussion of Paper of Rabbi Krass	115
Report on the Religious School Exhibit	118
Discussion of Rabbi Solomon's Paper	122
Report of Committee on Social and Religious Union	126
Discussion of Report of Committee on Instruction of Blind, Deaf Mutes, etc.	135
Report of Committee on Journal	144
Amendment to Article III, Section 1, of the Constitution	145
Report of Committee on Domestic Service	145
Report of Committee on Geiger Centenary	147
Report of Committee on Religious Work in Universities	150
Report of Committee on President's Message	154
Report of Committee on Memorial Resolutions	160

Memorial Resolutions in Honor of Joseph Mayor Asher.....	161
Report of Committee on Nominations	166
Report of Auditing Committee	167
Report of Committee on Resolutions	168
Report of Committee on Summer Congregations	184
Report of Committee on Thanks	188
Adjournment	190
Summary	191

APPENDIX.

A. Message of the President, Rabbi David Philipson.....	194
B. Paper—David Einhorn, The Uncompromising Champion of Reform, A Biographical Essay, by Rabbi K. Kohler.....	215
C. Paper—Intermarriage, Historically Considered, by Prof. Ephraim Feldman	271
D. Paper—Mixed Marriages in Their Relation to the Jewish Religion, by Rabbi Samuel Schulman	308
E. Paper—The Scope of the Religious School, by Rabbi Louis Grossman	336
F. A Review of Textbooks for Ethics, by Rabbi Nathan Krass....	348
G. Our Biblical Histories, by Rabbi Joseph S. Kornfeld.....	353
H. A Review of Courses of Study and Methods in Use in Jewish Sunday-Schools, by Rabbi George Solomon	388
I. Conference Sermon, The Old Wells, by Rabbi H. G. Enelow....	401
J. Paper—Samuel Adler, In Honor of the Centenary of his Birth, by Rabbi Joseph Silverman	415
K. Obituary Address—Adolph Moses Radin, by Rabbi Nathan Stern	424
L. Paper—The Workingman and the Synagogue, by Rabbi Solomon Foster	432
Memorial Page to Isaac M. Wise	495
Past Presidents	496
Deceased Members	496
List of Members	498
Publications	507
Books in Traveling Library of Committee on Church and State....	508

OFFICERS

FOR THE YEAR 1908-1909.

HONORARY PRESIDENT,
KAUFMAN KOHLER, Cincinnati, Ohio.

PRESIDENT,
DAVID PHILIPSON, Cincinnati, Ohio.

VICE-PRESIDENT,
MAX HELLER, New Orleans, La.

TREASURER,
CHARLES S. LEVI, Peoria, Ill.

RECORDING SECRETARY,
DAVID LEFKOWITZ, Dayton, Ohio.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY,
JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Cincinnati, Ohio.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

H. BERKOWITZ.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
H. G. ENELOW.....	Louisville, Ky.
W. H. GREENBURG.....	Dallas, Texas.
M. J. GRIES.....	Cleveland, O.
A. GUTTMACHER.....	Baltimore, Md.
S. HIRSHBERG.....	Milwaukee, Wis.
D. MARX.....	Atlanta, Ga.
M. NEWFIELD.....	Birmingham, Ala.
I. L. RYPINS.....	St. Paul, Minn.
S. SCHULMAN.....	New York City, N. Y.
J. STOLZ.....	Chicago, Ill.

STANDING COMMITTEES

1908-1909.

Publication.

A. Guttmacher,	S. Foster,	M. H. Harris,
M. A. Meyer,		S. H. Goldenson.

Relief Fund.

J. Stolz,	I. L. Rypins,	M. Messing.
-----------	---------------	-------------

Sermonic Literature.

S. Hirshberg,	N. Krass,	G. Solomon.
J. H. Stolz,		H. Weiss.

Ministers' Handbook.

H. G. Enelow,	H. W. Ettelson,	M. Heller,
E. Berkowitz,	M. M. Feuerlicht,	M. Merritt.

Contemporaneous History.

G. Deutsch,	M. N. A. Cohen,	E. Frisch.
-------------	-----------------	------------

Elaboration of a Systematic Jewish Theology.

S. Schulman,	E. Feldman,	M. Friedlander,
E. G. Hirsch,	K. Kohler,	J. Krauskopf,
M. Landsberg,	M. Lefkowitz,	D. Neumark,
	S. Sale.	

Social and Religious Union.

L. Wolsey,	J. Jasin,	E. W. Leipziger,
J. Rappaport,		A. Rhine.

Lyceum Bureau.

L. M. Franklin,	I. Aaron,	S. G. Bottigheimer,
S. L. Kory,		E. Mannheimer.

Church and State.

D. Lefkowitz,	H. Cohen,	W. S. Friedman,
E. Frisch,	M. Heller,	J. Krauskopf,
M. Newfield,	A. Simon,	J. B. Wise.

Geiger Centenary.

K. Kohler,	G. Deutsch,	H. G. Enelow,
E. G. Hirsch,	M. L. Margolis,	D. Neumark,
S. Sale,	S. Schulman,	D. Philipson.

Religious Work in Universities.

E. N. Calisch,	H. Englander,	A. Hirschberg,
	E. Kahn.	

Scripture Readings.

M. H. Harris,	S. H. Goldenson,	R. Grossman,
A. Lyons,		M. A. Meyer.

Domestic Service.

H. Berkowitz,	I. Landman,	E. Mayer,
C. A. Rubenstein,		M. Salzman.

Religious Schools.

M. J. Gries,	D. Alexander,	F. Cohn,
C. J. Freund,	L. Grossman,	J. H. Kaplan,
J. S. Kornfeld,	A. G. Moses,	G. Solomon,
L. Witt,		M. A. Meyer.

Curators of Archives.

J. Morgenstern,		J. Mielziner.
-----------------	--	---------------

Investments.

I. E. Marcuson,	C. S. Levi,	J. H. Meyer.
-----------------	-------------	--------------

Responsa.

K. Kohler,		D. Deutsch.
------------	--	-------------

Instruction of Blind, Deaf Mutes, Etc.

A. Simon,	D. Blaustein,	S. C. Lowenstein,
J. S. Kornfeld,		S. Peiser.

Harmonization of Mosaic and Modern Marriage Laws.

I. L. Rypins,	A. S. Anspacher,	I. L. Leucht,
A. Lyons,	S. Mannheimer,	I. S. Moses,
M. Silber,	J. Silverman.	

Editing Yearbook.

J. Morgenstern,	D. Lefkowitz,	D. Philipson.
-----------------	---------------	---------------

Synagogal Music.

D. Marx,	H. W. Ettelson,	N. Gordon,
E. Mayer,	N. Stern,	H. Weiss.

Tracts.

D. Philipson,	L. M. Franklin,	M. Heller,
J. Stolz,	L. Wolsey.	

Finance.

J. Morgenstern,	M. J. Gries,	D. Marx.
-----------------	--------------	----------

Summer Services.

G. Zepin,	T. Schanfarber,	W. H. Fineshreiber.
-----------	-----------------	---------------------

Journal.

M. Heller,	W. H. Greenburg,	M. Lovitch.
------------	------------------	-------------

OFFICERS

FOR THE YEAR 1909-1910.

HONORARY PRESIDENT,
KAUFMAN KOHLER, Cincinnati, Ohio.

PRESIDENT,
MAX HELLER, New Orleans, La.

VICE-PRESIDENT,
SAMUEL SCHULMAN, New York City.

TREASURER,
MOSES J. GRIES, Cleveland, Ohio.

RECORDING SECRETARY,
JULIAN MORGENSTERN, Cincinnati, Ohio.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY,
DAVID MARX, Atlanta, Ga.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

I. AARON.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
H. BERKOWITZ.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
H. COHEN.....	Galveston, Texas.
W. S. FRIEDMAN.....	Denver, Colo.
M. H. HARRIS.....	New York, N. Y.
E. G. HIRSCH.....	Chicago, Ill.
C. S. LEVI.....	Peoria, Ill.
D. PHILIPSON.....	Cincinnati, Ohio.
W. ROSENAU.....	Baltimore, Md.
I. L. RYPINS.....	St. Paul, Minn.
J. STOLZ.....	Chicago, Ill.

STANDING COMMITTEES 1909-1910.

Publication.

A. Guttmacher,	S. Foster,	S. H. Goldenson,
M. H. Harris,		A. Lyons.

Relief Fund.

J. Stolz,	C. S. Levi,	I. L. Rypins.
-----------	-------------	---------------

Sermonic Literature.

S. Hirshberg,	A. Brill,	J. Friedlander,
J. H. Kaplan,	H. Levi,	H. Weiss,
	N. Krass.	

Ministers' Handbook.

M. H. Harris,	H. G. Enelow,	S. Hirshberg,
H. Berkowitz,	M. M. Feuerlicht,	M. Merritt.

Contemporaneous History.

G. Deutsch,	M. N. A. Cohen,	H. W. Ettelson.
-------------	-----------------	-----------------

Elaboration of a Systematic Jewish Theology.

S. Schulman,	J. Krauskopf,	M. Landsberg,
E. Feldman,	K. Kohler,	F. de Sola Mendes,
M. Friedlander,	M. Lefkowitz,	D. Neumark,
	M. Raisin.	

Social and Religious Union.

H. Weiss,	E. W. Leipziger,	A. Rhine,
J. Jasin,		J. Rappaport.

Lyceum Bureau.

L. M. Franklin,	S. L. Kory,	S. G. Bottigheimer,
I. Aaron,		E. Mannheimer.

Church and State.

W. S. Friedman,	J. Krauskopf,	M. A. Meyer,
A. Simon,	N. Gordon,	D. Lefkowitz,
M. Newfield,		J. B. Wise.

Geiger Centenary.

K. Kohler,	H. G. Enelow,	D. Philipson,
G. Deutsch,	H. H. Mayer,	D. Neumark,
W. Rosenau,		S. Schulman.

Religious Work in Universities.

E. N. Calisch,	H. Englander,	A. Hirschberg,
E. Kahn,	F. Cohn,	B. Elzas,
S. Koch,		I. Warsaw.

Personal Prayers.

H. Berkowitz,	H. Fischer,	I. Landman,
E. Mayer,	C. A. Rubenstein,	M. Salzman.

Religious Education.

M. J. Gries,	H. G. Enelow,	M. H. Harris,
J. S. Kornfeld,	G. A. Kohut,	J. L. Levy,
H. Berkowitz,	W. H. Fineshreiber,	L. Grossman,
N. Krass,	J. Krauskopf,	J. H. Landau,
A. Simon,	G. Solomon,	J. Stolz.

Curators of Archives.

J. Morgenstern,	J. Mielziner.
-----------------	---------------

Investments.

I. E. Marcuson,	M. J. Gries,	J. H. Meyer.
-----------------	--------------	--------------

Responsa.

G. Deutsch,	K. Kohler.
-------------	------------

Instruction of Blind, Deaf Mutes, Etc.

A. Simon,	D. Blaustein,	J. S. Kornfeld,
S. C. Lowenstein,		S. Peiser.

Harmonization of Mosaic and Modern Marriage Laws.

E. Frisch,	J. Blau,	S. Deinard,
M. Silber,	A. Anspacher,	H. Barnstein,
	J. Silverman.	

Editing Yearbook.

J. Morgenstern,	D. Lefkowitz,	D. Philipson.
-----------------	---------------	---------------

Synagogal Music.

N. Stern,	B. C. Ehrenreich,	M. H. Harris,
H. H. Mayer,	D. Marx,	J. Singer,
L. D. Gross,	L. J. Kopald,	F. de Sola Mendes.

Tracts.

M. Heller,	L. M. Franklin,	D. Philipson,
J. Stolz,		L. Wolsey.

Finance.

D. Marx,	C. S. Levi,	J. Morgenstern.
----------	-------------	-----------------

Summer Services.

G. Zepin,	W. H. Fineshriber,	S. Hecht,
S. R. Cohen,	C. J. Freund,	T. Schanfarber.

Pulpit Bureau.

H. Cohen,	M. Bergman,	E. N. Calisch,
H. Englander,	M. Friedlander,	W. S. Friedman,
M. H. Harris,	J. Rauch,	G. Zepin.

Conversion Formula.

D. Philipson,	H. G. Enelow,	L. M. Franklin,
K. Kohler,		D. Neumark.

Enlargement and Revision of the Prayer Book.

J. Stolz,	M. Heller,	M. H. Harris,
I. S. Moses,	A. Guttmacher,	K. Kohler,
T. Schanfarber,		J. Silverman.

Free Distribution of Conference Publications.

M. Heller,	D. Philipson,	J. Stolz.
------------	---------------	-----------

Board of Arbitration.

J. Stolz,	G. B. Levi,	T. Schanfarber.
-----------	-------------	-----------------

Soliciting Funds.

J. Morgenstern,
M. Heller,

M. J. Gries,
D. Marx,
J. Stolz.

A. Guttmacher,
D. Philipson,

Bible Fund.

D. Philipson,
W. H. Greenburg,
A. G. Moses,

L. Harrison,
J. Leucht,

S. Hecht,
G. B. Levi,
S. Schwartz.

TEMPORARY COMMITTEES OF NEW YORK CONVENTION

President's Message.

HENRY BERKOWITZ, *Chairman.*

H. Cohen,	J. Krauskopf,	S. Schulman,
M. Friedlander,	M. A. Meyer,	J. Stolz,
K. Kohler,	M. Schlesinger,	L. Wolsey.

Resolutions.

H. G. ENELOW, *Chairman.*

M. C. Currick,	S. H. Goldenson,	D. Marx,
G. G. Fox,	A. Guttman,	W. Rosenau,
W. S. Friedman,	A. S. Isaacs,	J. Silverman,
	C. S. Levi,	

Auditing.

M. H. HARRIS, *Chairman.*

I. Aaron,	C. J. Freund,	I. L. Rypins,
	A. Lyons.	

Memorial Resolutions.

M. NEWFIELD, *Chairman.*

A. Brill,	G. N. Hausmann,	J. S. Kornfeld,
B. C. Ehrenreich,	E. Kahn,	G. Solomon.

Thanks.

S. HIRSHBERG, *Chairman.*

D. Alexander,	S. Cohen,	J. H. Landau,
A. Brill,	C. Fleischer,	F. A. Levy,
	W. H. Greenburg.	

Nominations.

M. J. GRIES, *Chairman.*

M. M. Feuerlicht,	L. M. Franklin,	H. H. Mayer,
W. H. Fineshreiber,	M. H. Harris,	M. Salzman,
S. Foster,		N. Krass.

Press.

I. LANDMAN, *Chairman.*

M. Bergman,	E. Frisch,	E. Mayer,
	D. Lefkowitz.	

On Attending the Funeral of Rabbi Joseph Mayor Asher.

K. Kohler,	J. Leucht,	W. Rosenau,
M. Elkin,	J. H. Landau,	T. Schanfarber,
N. Stern,		S. Schulman.

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS

Program of Twentieth Annual Convention, New York City, November 9-16, 1909.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, NOVEMBER 9, 1909.

Meeting of the Executive Committee at the Savoy Hotel.

TUESDAY EVENING,

Temple Beth El.

Evening Service (Union Prayer book, I pp. 231-240).

Music.

Prayer Rabbi F. de Sola Mendes

Address of Welcome Rabbi Samuel Schulman

President's Address Rabbi David Philipson

Announcements.

Closing Prayer and Benediction..... Rabbi Martin A. Meyer

Postlude.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 10, 1909.

Temple Beth El.

Prayer Rabbi Henry Englander
Roll Call.

Report of Corresponding Secretary.... Rabbi Julian Morgenstern

Report of Recording Secretary..... Rabbi David Lefkowitz

Report of Treasurer Rabbi Charles S. Levi

Report of Publication Committee..... Rabbi Adolf Guttmacher

Report of Finance Committee..... Rabbi Julian Morgenstern

Paper—David Einhorn, in honor of the one hundredth

• anniversary of his birth..... Rabbi Kaufman Kohler

Discussion led by..... Rabbi Max Landsberg

WEDNESDAY EVENING.

Temple Beth El.

Service in honor of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of David Einhorn.

Music.

Prayer Rabbi Max C. Currick

Scripture Reading Rabbi David Alexander

Music.

Introductory Remarks The President

Memorial Address Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch

Music.

Announcements.

Closing Prayer and Benediction..... Rabbi Rudolph Grossman

Postlude.

THURSDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER, 11, 1909.

Temple Emanuel.

Prayer Rabbi Abram Brill

Report of Committee on Scripture Readings

Rabbi Maurice H. Harris

Memorial Address in Honor of Rabbi Joseph Mayor Asher

Rabbi Maurice H. Harris

Report of Committee on Revision of Union Hymnal

Rabbi David Marx

Report of Committee on Relation of Church and State

Rabbi David Lefkowitz

THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

Papers on Inter-marriage:

From the Historical Standpoint..... Prof. Ephraim Feldman

Mixed Marriages Considered in their Relation to the

Jewish Religion Rabbi Samuel Schulman

Discussion led by Rabbi Isaac S. Moses

Report of Committee on Sermonic Literature

Rabbi Samuel Hirshberg

RELIGIOUS SCHOOL DAY.

FRIDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 12, 1909.

Temple Beth El.

Report of Committee on Instruction of Blind, Deaf Mutes,
etc. Rabbi Abram Simon
Report of Committee on Lyceum Bureau... Rabbi Leo M. Franklin
Report of Committee on Religious Schools... Rabbi Moses J. Gries
Paper—The Province of the Sabbath School. Rabbi Louis Grossman
Review of Textbooks for Ethics..... Rabbi Nathan Krass
Discussion led by Rabbi Henry Berkowitz
Review of Biblical Histories..... Rabbi Joseph H. Kornfeld
Discussion led by Rabbi Leo M. Franklin
Report on the Religious School Exhibit..... Rabbi Moses J. Gries

FRIDAY AFTERNOON.

Review of Courses of Study in Jewish Religious Schools
Rabbi George Solomon
Discussion led by { Rabbi Isaac Landman
Rabbi Abram Simon
Rabbi Joseph Stolz

CONFERENCE SERVICE.

FRIDAY EVENING.

Temple Emanuel.

Sabbath Eve Service (Union Prayer book, I pp. 15-54).
Scripture Reading Rabbi J. Leon Magnes
Conference Sermon Rabbi H. G. Enelow
Music.
Memorial Address in honor of the one hundredth anniversary
of the birth of Samuel Adler
Rabbi Joseph Silverman
Music.
Closing Prayer and Benediction..... Rabbi Wm. S. Friedman

MONDAY AFTERNOON, NOVEMBER 15, 1909.

Prayer Rabbi Simon R. Cohen
Report of Committee on Social and Religious Union
Rabbi Louis Wolsey
Report of Committee on Journal..... Rabbi Max Heller
Report of Committee on Domestic Service.. Rabbi Henry Berkowitz
Report of Committee on Geiger Centenary..... Rabbi K. Kohler

TUESDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 16, 1909.

Prayer Rabbi Charles J. Freund
Report of Committee on Religious Work in Universities
Rabbi Edward N. Calisch
Report of Committee on President's Message
Rabbi Henry Berkowitz
Memorial Address in Honor of Rabbi Adolph M. Radin
Rabbi Nathan Stern
Report of Committee on Memorial Resolutions
Rabbi Morris Newfield
Paper—The Workingman and the Synagogue
Rabbi Solomon Foster
Discussion led by { Rabbi Maurice H. Harris
Rabbi Henry Cohen

TUESDAY AFTERNOON.

Report of Committee on Nominations..... Rabbi Moses J. Gries
Election of Officers.
Report of Auditing Committee..... Rabbi Maurice H. Harris
Report of Committee on Resolutions..... Rabbi H. G. Enelow
Report of Committee on Summer Congregations
Rabbi George Zepin
Report of Committee on Thanks..... Rabbi Samuel Hirshberg
Closing Prayer and Benediction..... Rabbi K. Kohler

PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF THE
CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS,
Held at New York City, November 9-16, 1909.

TUESDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 9, 1909.

The opening meeting of the Conference was held in Temple Beth-El at 8:00 p. m. The invocation was delivered by Rabbi F. de Sola Mendes.

Rabbi Samuel Schulman welcomed the Conference in the following words:

"Blessed be ye who come in the name of God. We bless you from the House of God."

GENTLEMEN OF THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS, COLLEAGUES AND FRIENDS: It is with much joy that I welcome you to this House of God, to our Jewish community and to our great city. You, who are soldiers of the spirit standing before the world for the God of Israel, and the kind of life He asks of us; you who are ready with zeal to proclaim our faith, with courage to defend it, you come to us in accordance with the saying of Scripture, maturely equipped for the great work. In accordance with the ancient Hebrew law, **מִבֵּן עֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה וּמַעֲלָה** every son of Israel, from twenty years and upwards, was to be ready to defend and protect his people, to fight its battles and to extend its dominion. This twentieth annual meeting of the Central Conference of American Rabbis finds you with that experience, with that performance of early promise, which makes you a valiant power on behalf of the holy interests of Israel. We welcome you, therefore, to this Temple, "The House of God," whose name reminds us of that glorious dream which came to him who first bore the name of Israel, revealing the vision of a ladder uniting earth and heaven. As our sages say, this ladder was the sanctuary. **סוֹלָם זֶה מִקְדָּשׁ**. So every synagogue is the place in which

the omnipresence of God's unity is borne in upon man, and in which the Jew becomes conscious of that which distinguishes him from others, and alone gives him his individuality. This is not the time to enter upon a discussion of that wherein the Jewish consciousness consists—whether, as some maintain, it is purely racial, or as others maintain, it is purely religious. It cannot be denied by anyone that it is the great spiritual interests for which Israel stands that gives the Jew the right to exist in the world as Jew. You, therefore, leaders and teachers in Israel, are the representatives of the soul of Israel. Welcome therefore to the House of God, where Israel's uniqueness is most clearly and most justly expressed. We welcome you on behalf of this great Jewish community, greater than which there is none in the world. Its deeds of beneficence triumph over and render insignificant the divisions in Israel and proclaim the deep underlying Jewish unity, and its scholarship certainly knows well the Talmudic saying that, be the parties ever so zealously and honestly divided in their interpretation of the Torah, our sacred heritage, after all, "These, as well as those, proclaim the words of the living God." We welcome you on behalf of this great city of ours, which in its varied population, in the peaceful co-operation for civic righteousness and social reform, of clashing creeds and diversified races, in its cosmopolitanism, and, at the same time, its broad-minded Americanism, is type of the ideals of the republic. On behalf of congregation, of community and of the city, I bid you thrice welcome.

And I consider it a great honor to be the spokesman of the cordiality with which, I am delighted to say, New York is meeting your visit. And it is just that such hearty greeting should hail your coming, for you have done lasting work on behalf of American Judaism. If, as our sages beautifully say, "the lips of the immortal dead still speak sweetly to the ears of the reverent," *יְדוּכָב שְׁפָתַי יִשְׁנִים* then, indeed, it must be a joyous moment in heaven, and we can, in the depths of our hearts, hear the voices of congratulation and encouragement of a Wise, of an Einhorn and of an Adler, contemplating from their home of everlasting reward this gathering of Rabbis from all parts of the country, come together in the spirit of amity and brotherly love, fearlessly to proclaim and peacefully to promote that Judaism for which they laid the foundations with great genius for organization, with prophetic zeal and eloquence, with mastery of Jewish learning. That great man, Isaac M. Wise, has left an immortal record for himself in the history of American Judaism. He has left institutions indissolubly bound up with his name. And the institution that stands second in rank to none, as a power for good in American Jewish life, is the Central Conference of American Rabbis, which, twenty years ago, he fathered in its infancy, and which tonight stands panoplied in its manhood with a reputation for splendid achievement. The Central Conference of American Rabbis has unified Reform

Judaism. It has made clear and strengthened the catholic consciousness in Israel. In a time of reform and individual initiative it has done what was most necessary—made the American Rabbi feel that, greater than any individual, is the moral power and authority that speaks out of a united body of leaders and teachers, that represents for our age the Beth Din, that is great in numbers. The Conference has, in the course of twenty years, unified the spirit of Israel, and made Jewish men and women in all cities, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the North to the South, feel the joyous sense of the common possession of their modern faith in providing them with a uniform book of prayer. Steadily, step by step, the Conference has been a building and educating power in American Judaism. It has not destroyed, it has built up. Though conscious, and unafraid to speak and act without equivocation, of that tendency in modern Judaism for which it stands, it has never lost the feeling of solidarity with the whole house of Israel. Thank God, such are the conditions in American Judaism today, and such is the natural result of the spirit which has animated the history of the Conference, that, in the great work of providing for the American synagogue an English translation of our Scriptures, it wholesouledly co-operates with those who are by no means ready to endorse its philosophy of Judaism and subscribe to its ideals for the American Jew.

It is a distinction for a Jewish community that does not let its feeling of Jewish brotherhood be disintegrated by any partisan prejudice, to welcome such a body as yours, large in numbers and successful in achievement. It is an honor to welcome the Conference because of the distinction which many of its members have won for themselves in the leadership of American Israel. Your body, gentlemen of the Conference, holds men who have maintained the holy tradition of the moral courage of the prophets, and have not hesitated fearlessly to speak to the nation, as well as to our own religious communion, on behalf of justice. In your body are men who have maintained the sacred traditions of Jewish learning and have wholesouledly devoted themselves to the creative study of our history and literature. In your body are the men with great ability to organize and to translate the teachings of Israel into the practical deeds of culture and beneficence, as they are required by the circumstances of our time and country. In your body are men with the true priestly spirit, who turn many away from iniquity, who are messengers of peace amongst men. We honor ourselves, therefore, in bidding you welcome. Preachers, scholars of the Torah, practical realizers of its teachings, ministers to men in its spirit—you are the real leaders in Israel. For, as a sage, R. Simlai, has it, compared with the Torah—that is, the Divine teaching, the soul of Judaism—everything is cheapened: “The universe was in great glory until the Torah was given. When the Divine law was given it paled into insignificance.”

To what do we welcome you? We welcome you to the inspiration and strength from contact with the big Jewish heart of the largest Jewish community of the world. If it is an honor for New York to receive you, it is an opportunity for you to see New York Jewry. For it cannot be denied that, in order to study Judaism completely and exhaustively, one must come to New York, for it is the Jewish world in miniature. Here are Jews from all countries of the world. Here are Jews representing all the different tendencies of thought that are today dominant in Israel. Here is Jewish history illustrated. This community tells the story of the Jewish sorrow and of the Jewish grandeur. The best that is of the Jew can be found here, and the effects of centuries of persecution are here too visible. Jewish idealism celebrates its triumphs in New York. On the one hand, behold the matchless chain of institutions of beneficence, forged link by link by the American Jew, and on the other hand, here you will find the old holy traditions in Israel maintained: a Jewish workingman, or pedlar, at the end of a day's hard labor, seeking his recreation in drinking deeply from the inexhaustible fountains of the Torah and of modern culture. The heart of Israel of America is in this city. Here are the greatest number of those who are filled with the yearning for Zion as a re-establishment of the ancient glories, and here again, meeting them face to face, questioning not their motives, respecting their convictions, but differing profoundly with them, are the men who believe that the American republic offers the grandest opportunity ever presented in Israel's history of realizing the ideals of a Moses and an Isaiah. Therefore, while we feel honored in welcoming you, we trust you will rejoice in being welcomed. For the Central Conference of American Rabbis, even as in the myth the giant, in order to replenish his strength, had to touch earth, must from time to time come to this great Jewish community, in order to touch again the soil of Jewish history, fertilized with the blood of martyrs, watered with their tears, and yet made resplendent and fruitful with the sun of truth and righteousness ever shining upon it.

At this Convention of the Central Conference of Rabbis, representing the Reform idea, in a city that contains Jews of all kinds, and which, during the last two decades, has been veritably transformed, both with respect to the problems forced upon it and to the intellectual leadership and great learning transplanted to it from across the seas, it is most appropriate that we celebrate the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of David Einhorn. He was one of the most original, profound and eloquent of the creators of Reform Judaism. By his unyielding hold upon the thought of Israel, as a priest-people, a race with its sublime mission, serving God in all ages and in all lands, he stands out, perhaps, of all the reformers, as the one who most completely belonged to all Israel and best interpreted one of its immortal truths. Both tomorrow morning and tomorrow night those who are his sons in spirit, as well as his sons-in-law,

will speak with scholarship and eloquence of what Einhorn was for American Judaism. But you will certainly bear with me if, in a few words, I take this opportunity of speaking in this welcome that which has always been in my heart, of loyalty to and reverence for the memory of this great master in Israel, whose pulpit I have the honor to hold. Many might ask why we have made a chief feature of our Conference week the celebration of his memory. They might say, in the words of the Song of Songs, *ימה דורך מרוד שוכנה השבעתנו* What is it, with thy friend or with thy David, more than with any other, that thus thou dost adjure us? And our answer is, My friend, my David, is white, and with the red blood of courage, the chiefest amongst ten thousand. Our David is white and pure. He gave us that clear, fearless, uncompromising distinction between what is eternal and what is changeable in Judaism. He brought out clearly and unmistakably the everlasting kernel of Judaism, as it speaks in Mosaism and in the prophets. And he would not compromise with that tendency which would seek to enfeeble the weighty matters of the law by laying undue stress on a ceremonialism from which life had departed. He was the man who would always sacrifice interest, the influence of numbers, the prestige and power of position, for what he considered the truth. A favorite phrase of his was, "Klein und rein"—be it small, let it be pure. While he was the reformer, anticipating in his advocacy every reform necessary for the development and maintenance of American Judaism, he had a strong grip upon historic institutions. He would not water away the conception of Israel by making it merely a denomination. Israel was for him always the priest-people. He would not give up the Jewish Sabbath, while he made provision for the week-day Sunday service. This purity of principle, this clear-cut distinction between the eternal and changeable, between what could be swept away by time and that which is to triumph over all time; this combination of reformer and conservator of Israel's integrity he presented to the world with the courage, indeed, of the prophets of old; and when his soul was enkindled with the flame of zeal for the righteous cause, then like a prophet of old he would take his life in his hands, and, as he proved in Baltimore, would preach the message of justice and freedom for the black man, even though his life was threatened. It is a great privilege for a body like ours to commemorate the birthday of such a master. May his spirit hover over our deliberations. May we be like him—fearlessly liberal and faithfully loyal. May we be in the face of this great Jewish community always ourselves, representatives of the American Judaism for which this Conference stands. And may we at the same time, like him, not lose hold of the thought that the greatest of parties is but a fragment of a greater than it—Israel, the priest-people of God. In this spirit I welcome you, colleagues, brethren and friends, and may He who caused His name to dwell in this Beth-El, House of God,

dwell in your midst, so that there be in this week of renewal of personal ties, of hearty co-operation on behalf of Israel's cause, a spirit of peace and goodwill, brotherliness and friendship. Amen.

The President, Rabbi David Philipson, responded to this address of welcome, and then proceeded with the reading of his message. (cf. Appendix *a*.)

The service was concluded with prayer and benediction by Rabbi Martin A. Meyer.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 10, 1909.

The Conference convened at 9:30 a. m., at Temple Beth-El. The session was opened with prayer by Rabbi Henry Englander.

During the Convention the following ninety-seven members responded to the roll-call:

Aaron. I., Buffalo. N. Y.
Alexander, D., Toledo, O.
Anspacher, A. S., Scranton, Pa.
Bergman, M., New Orleans, La.
Berkowitz, H., Philadelphia, Pa.
Blau, J., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Brill, A., Greenville, Miss.
Calisch, E. N., Richmond, Va.
Cohen, H., Galveston, Tex.
Cohen, S. R., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Currick, M. C., Erie, Pa.
Deutsch, G., Cincinnati, O.
Ehrenreich, B. C., Montgomery, Ala.
Elkin, M., Hartford, Conn.
Enelow, H. G., Louisville, Ky.
Englander, H., Providence, R. I.
Feuerlicht, M. M., Indianapolis, Ind.
Fineshriber, W. H., Davenport, Ia.
Fleischer, C., Boston, Mass.
Foster, S., Newark, N. J.
Fox, G. G., Bloomington, Ill.
Frank, J., Reading, Pa.
Franklin, L. M., Detroit, Mich.
Freund, C. J., Salt Lake City, Utah.

- Friedlander, M., Oakland, Cal.
Friedman, W. S., Denver, Col.
Frisch, E., Pine Bluff, Ark.
Goldenson, S., Albany, N. Y.
Goldstein, S., New York City.
Greenburg, W. H., Dallas, Tex.
Gries, M. J., Cleveland, O.
Gross, L. D., Akron, O.
Grossman, R., New York City.
Grossman, L., Cincinnati, O.
Guttmacher, A., Baltimore, Md.
Guttman, A., Syracuse, N. Y.
Harris, M. H., New York City.
Hausmann, G. N., New York City.
Hirsch, E. G., Chicago, Ill.
Hirshberg, S., Milwaukee, Wis.
Isaacs, A. S., New York City.
Jacobs, P., Jacksonville, Fla.
Jasin, J., New York City.
Joseph, T., Troy, N. Y.
Kahn, E., Grand Rapids, Mich.
Kaplan, J. H., Selma, Ala.
Kohler, K., Cincinnati, O.
Kohut, G. A., New York City.
Kornfeld, J. S., Columbus, O.
Krass, N., Rochester, N. Y.
Krauskopf, J., Philadelphia, Pa.
Landau, J. H., Philadelphia, Pa.
Landman, I., Philadelphia, Pa.
Landsberg, M., Rochester, Pa.
Lefkowitz, D., Dayton, O.
Leipziger, E. W., Terre Haute, Ind.
Leiser, J., Allentown, Pa.
Leucht, J., Newark, N. J.
Levi, C. S., Peoria, Ill.
Levy, F. A., Chicago, Ill.
Lowenstein, S. C., New York City.
Lyons, A., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Magnes, J. L., New York City.
Mannheimer, L., Paterson, N. J.
Marx, D., Atlanta, Ga.
Mayer, E., Philadelphia, Pa.
Mayer, H. H., Kansas City, Mo.
Mendes, F. de S., New York City.

Meyer, M. A., San Francisco, Cal.
 Morgenstern, J., Cincinnati, O.
 Moses, I. S., New York City.
 Newfield, M., Birmingham, Ala.
 Philipson, D., Cincinnati, O.
 Raisin, M., Meridian, Miss.
 Rauch, J., Sioux City, Ia.
 Reichler, M., Schenectady, N. Y.
 Rosenau, W., Baltimore, Md.
 Rosenbaum, D., Amsterdam, N. Y.
 Rosenthal, I., Lancaster, Pa.
 Rothstein, L. J., Alexandria, La.
 Rypins, I. L., St. Paul, Minn.
 Sadler, B., Easton, Pa.
 Salzman, M., Wilkes Barre, Pa.
 Schanfarber, T., Chicago, Ill.
 Schlesinger, M., Albany, N. Y.
 Schreiber, E., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Schulman, S., New York City.
 Silverman, J., New York City.
 Simon, A., Washington, D. C.
 Singer, J., York, Pa.
 Solomon, G., Savannah, Ga.
 Stein, N., Trenton, N. J.
 Stolz, J., Chicago, Ill.
 Wintner, L., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Wise, S. S., New York City.
 Wolsey, L., Cleveland, O.
 Zepin, G., Ft. Worth, Tex.

During the Convention, communications and telegrams were received from the Jewish Community of New York City, the Federation of Jewish Organizations and Rabbis M. N. A. Cohen, M. Heller, A. Hirschberg, S. L. Kory, J. Mielziner, J. H. Stolz, and H. Weiss.

The Chair—Gentlemen, before we proceed to any further business, I wish to call attention to the fact, that the morning papers announce the death of Dr. Joseph Mayor Asher. Although not in sympathy with our point of view, he was one of the most earnest, sincere and able men in the Jewish pulpit. I, therefore, believe that it is only proper that this Conference should take some action. I will call on Dr. Kohler to make a statement.

Rabbi Kohler—Mr. President, I read with feelings of great sorrow, the news of the sudden death of one who is certainly a representative of Jewish scholarship and an honor to the Jewish ministry, a man who, as our President has just remarked, was sincere and thoroughly honest and consistent. While not siding with us, he certainly reflected honor upon the rabbinate. He was a man who could trace his pedigree far back to a family of scholars in Russia. He acquired a knowledge thoroughly philosophical, even to erudition. He was educated in England, and after having there distinguished himself as a student, he came here and worked in the spirit in which he had been consistent, even to an extreme. But it seems to me, Mr. President, that we should show that, while we differ in many things from the teaching of the man who died and the wing of Judaism to which he belonged, we are eager to honor a man who was thoroughly, tremendously in earnest. I, therefore, propose first that resolutions of condolence be passed either at this or some other meeting, and, secondly, since we can hardly attend the funeral in a body, that we send a delegation to represent this Conference at the funeral of Rabbi Asher.

Rabbi Silverman—We would all like to be present at the funeral tomorrow, but of course, it will be impossible, on account of the work laid out. Dr. Asher was held in such high esteem, that I amend the motion by adding, that we hold a fifteen minute memorial service tomorrow morning.

The two, motion and amendment, were combined and were duly seconded and carried. The President appointed as the delegation to attend the funeral, Rabbis Kohler, Leucht, Rosenau, Elkin, Landau, Schanfarber, Nathan Stern, Schulman.

The report of the Corresponding Secretary, Rabbi Julian Morgenstern, was then read, and on motion received, and referred to the Auditing Committee.

REPORT OF CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN: Your Corresponding Secretary begs leave to report that during the sixteen months, July, 1908,—October, 1909, all the duties of the office were carefully and conscientiously discharged. The following one hundred and twenty-one vouchers have been issued, totaling \$7,305.99.

1908.

June	22,	Pension	\$ 41.63
"	22,	Pension	25.00
"	22,	The Mailing and Advertising Co., for packing, express- ing and mailing Tract I.	2.44
"	22,	C. J. Krehbiel & Co., for 500 Conference programs..	15.00
"	22,	David Lefkowitz, for expenses of Church and State Committee	9.65
"	22,	J. Morgenstern, for postage and typewriter repairs..	13.54
"	22,	Williams & Co., for binding	75.00
July	9,	Stettiner Bros., for balance due on week-day service..	100.00
"	9,	Central Trust & Safe Deposit Co., for rental of space..	6.75
"	9,	Pension	41.67
"	9,	Pension	25.00
"	9,	J. Morgenstern, for subvention for Ehrlich	50.00
"	9,	J. Morgenstern, expenses at Frankfort Conference ..	51.90
"	9,	J. Morgenstern, for allowance of office for July.	25.00
"	9,	C. J. Krehbiel & Co., for additional printing for Frank- fort Conference	10.75
Aug.	6,	Leland B. Case, for reporting Frankfort Conference..	80.00
"	6,	Pension	41.67
"	6,	Pension	25.00
"	6,	J. Morgenstern, allowance for August and additional expenses at Frankfort Conference	26.15
Sept.	7,	Stationery for Treasurer	4.25
"	7,	D. Philipson, hotel expenses in New York City.	13.80
"	7,	Pension	41.67
"	7,	Pension	25.00
"	7,	J. Morgenstern, allowance for September.	25.00
"	7,	D. Lefkowitz, for expenses on Year-Book Committee.	2.50
Oct.	9,	C. J. Krehbiel & Co., for printing	39.35
"	9,	T. Rubovits, addressing, mailing and postage on ser- mons	7.74
"	9,	S. E. Tate Printing Co., for 1,000 holiday sermons..	60.00
"	9,	Pension	41.66
"	9,	J. Morgenstern, allowance for October	25.00
"	22,	The Publishers' Printing Co., for printing and binding	1,144.92

Nov.	1,	C. J. Krehbiel & Co., for Year-Book plates.....	16.15
"	1,	S. Schulman, for trip to Cincinnati, and Committee on Theology	53.00
"	1,	I. L. Rypins, for trip to Cincinnati	40.00
"	1,	S. Hirshberg, for trip to Cincinnati	24.00
"	1,	Max Heller, for trip to Cincinnati	53.40
"	1,	C. S. Levi, for trip to Cincinnati and expenses of office	37.50
"	1,	A. Guttmacher, for trip to Cincinnati	38.00
"	1,	L. M. Franklin, for mailing 1,000 Lyceum Bureau prospectus	10.00
"	1,	The American Press, for printing	29.50
"	1,	The Phoenix Club, for lunch for Executive Committee	11.40
"	1,	D. Philipson, for dinner for Executive Committee....	11.00
"	1,	J. Morgenstern, for allowance for November and Executive Committee expenses	28.00
"	1,	Pension	41.67
"	1,	J. Stolz, for trip to Cincinnati	16.00
"	5,	H. G. Enelow, for trip to Cincinnati	15.00
"	5,	J. Morgenstern, for postage on 5,000 Tract I.	50.00
Dec.	2,	Stettiner Bros., for printing for Scripture Readings Committee	315.00
"	2,	Mailing and Advertising Co., for mailing and addressing 4,876 Tract I.	8.03
"	2,	Wm. C. Popper, for balance due on hymnals.....	142.64
"	2,	M. J. Greis, for trip to Cincinnati	12.40
"	2,	D. Lefkowitz, for trip to Cincinnati, typewriting and mailing minutes	3.80
"	2,	Pension	41.67
"	2,	J. Morgenstern, for allowance for December	25.00
"	2,	C. S. Levi, for postage and expressage	5.65
"	4,	C. J. Krehbiel & Co., for printing 10,000 Tract I, and additional printing	69.75
"	7,	The Publishers' Printing Co., for binding and plate boxes	81.56
"	7,	Williams & Co., for balance on binding	314.04
"	10,	Morris Rose, for insurance for \$2,000 on plates.....	20.38
"	10,	C. A. Rubenstein, for Domestic Service Committee expenses	11.65
Jan.	10,	M. Katz & Son, for insurance on Haggadah plates... .	2.00
"	10,	Pension	41.66
"	10,	J. Morgenstern, for allowance for January	25.00
Feb.	6,	Edgar Daniels, for typewriting Executive Committee minutes	7.14
"	6,	Pension	41.67

Feb.	6,	J. Morgenstern, for trip to Philadelphia and allowance for February	57.00
"	15,	J. Morgenstern, for addressing and mailing 840 Year Books	95.00
Mar.	1,	Murphy-Parker Co., for binding Haggadoth	38.50
"	1,	D. Neumark, for subvention	50.00
"	1,	Pension	41.67
"	1,	J. Morgenstern, for allowance for March	25.00
"	8,	S. Rosenthal & Co., for printing Year Book, reprints, etc.	699.54
"	15,	The Publishers' Printing Co., for printing Hymnal, binding and plate corrections	514.41
"	15,	Williams & Co., for binding	56.64
"	15,	Simon Wolf, for insurance on Haggadoth	2.97
"	15,	The Mailing and Advertising Co., for mailing, etc., Year Books	5.26
Apr.	7,	D. Philipson, for typewriting and postage	5.00
"	7,	J. Morgenstern, for postage on Tracts and Year Books, and allowance for April	106.00
"	7,	Pension	41.66
"	7,	Pension	15.00
"	7,	Gibbon, Dickelman, Furst and Bourke, for renewal of Treasurer's bond	20.00
May	9,	The Mailing and Advertising Co., for printing and addressing	6.39
"	9,	M. Katz & Son, for insurance on Haggadoth	2.97
"	9,	Pension	41.67
"	9,	Pension	15.00
"	9,	J. Morgenstern, for allowance for May	25.00
June	8,	The Publishers' Printing Co., for binding	75.00
"	8,	C. J. Krehbiel & Co., for printing Tract II and 10,000 envelopes	97.00
"	8,	J. D. Eisenstein, for 3 Vol. III Hebrew Encyclopedia	9.00
"	8,	J. Morgenstern, for postage on 4,400 Tract II	41.40
"	8,	Pension	41.67
"	8,	Pension	15.00
"	8,	J. Morgenstern, for allowance for June	25.00
"	12,	The Publishers' Printing Co., for binding	90.00
"	12,	C. S. Levi, for postage	8.40
"	12,	D. Marx, for trip to Cincinnati	25.00
"	14,	C. J. Krehbiel & Co., for printing 10,000 Tract II	59.00
Aug.	7,	Edgar Daniels, for typewriting and mailing minutes	2.17
"	7,	The Mailing and Advertising Co., for postage	1.90
"	7,	Central Trust & Safe Deposit Co., for rental of space	6.75

"	7,	Pension	83.33
"	7,	Pension	30.00
"	7,	J. Morgenstern, for allowance for July and August..	50.00
"	21,	Pension	41.67
"	21,	Pension	15.00
"	21,	J. Morgenstern, for allowance for September	25.00
Oct.	13,	L. Wolsey, for expenses of Social and Religious Union	
		Committee	19.75
"	13,	Starchroom Publishing Co., for printing	2.25
"	13,	The Publishers' Printing Co., for binding	597.90
"	13,	S. E. Tate Printing Co., for printing sermons	58.00
"	13,	The Multi-Letter Shop, typewriting, mailing and postage	8.15
"	13,	Pension	41.66
"	13,	Pension	15.00
"	13,	J. Morgenstern, for allowance for October	25.00
"	14,	The Publishers' Printing Co., for binding	128.13
"	14,	Starchroom Publishing Co., for printing and mailing	11.03
"	14,	D. Philipson, for typewriting, postage and telegrams	10.00
"	22,	The American Press, for printing for Lyceum Bureau	
		Committee	4.50
"	22,	C. S. Levi, for expenses of office	29.50
"	22,	L. M. Franklin, for expenses for Lyceum Bureau	4.00
"	22,	Bloch Publishing Co., for books for Sabbath-School	
		Committee (per N. Krass)	3.45

In conclusion, permit me to express my deep appreciation of the honor you have conferred upon me during the past two years.

Respectfully submitted,

JULIAN MORGENSTERN,

Corresponding Secretary.

The report of the Recording Secretary, Rabbi David Lefkowitz, was then read, and on motion was received and ordered printed.

REPORT OF THE RECORDING SECRETARY.

To the President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

The Executive Committee, whose transactions it was my duty to record, and, at the annual meeting of the Conference, to sum up, met five times since the last Conference: July 8, 1908, October 20, 1908, January 18, 1909, June 13, 1909, and November 9, 1909. The summary of the work done and decisions reached at these several meetings is as follows:

At its first sitting the Executive Committee authorized a new edition of 5,000 copies each of Vols. I and II of the Union Prayer Book, competitive bids to be asked for. At a later meeting the order was given to the lowest bidders judged perfectly responsible, the Publishers' Printing Co., of New York City. In the course of these transactions an overcharge of \$722.00 by our binders was discovered, and, after negotiations, was refunded. Five hundred copies of the Haggadah were ordered printed, and it was decided that it devolved upon the selling agent to properly advertise this publication. Seven hundred and fifty copies of the Week-day Service, which were already printed, were ordered bound, and later turned over to our selling agent.

Early in the meetings of the Executive Committee it was resolved that no more editions of the Union Hymnal be struck off until a revision of the book had been completed by the proper committee and approved of by the Conference. The Union Hymnal Committee, through its Chairman, Rabbi David Marx, presented an exhaustive report, which showed that a great deal of revision would have to be made. Still, as an act of necessity, as copies of the Union Hymnal were being called for, 2,000 copies were ordered printed.

It was ordered that a second edition of 10,000 copies of Tract I, "What do Jews Believe?" be printed, 5,000 to be distributed immediately; also, that the second Tract, "The Jew in America," be published in an edition of 10,000 copies. These tracts, it was decided, should be distributed free of charge, but anyone who wrote for a large order was to be asked for a contribution to the Tract Fund.

Reprints of papers read at the last Conference were ordered: two hundred of Drs. Neumark and Morgenstern and Rabbi Heller, one hundred of these to go to the authors, the rest held for distribution.

Fifty copies of the Union Prayer-Book were sent, at Dr. Nathan Stern's request, to the New Jersey state prison for the use of the prisoners; three hundred copies of the Week-day Service, rejected because of mistakes, were ordered sent to Dr. Radin for the New York city prison.

The Executive Committee, acting upon the wish of the Conference at its last annual meeting, transmitted a subvention of \$50.00 to Dr. Ehrlich. A subvention of \$50.00 was also allowed to Dr. Neumark for his Vol. II, History of Jewish Philosophy, in return for copies of the work when published.

The President was authorized to appoint a Committee on Sabbath-School Exhibit, and \$50.00 was appropriated to the committee for the beginning of a permanent exhibit. Later it was decided that an entire day of the annual Conference be given over to Sabbath-School work, this committee to have in charge the preparation of the program.

The members appointed by the Executive Board to represent the Conference, on the Joint Committee of the Conference, and the Jewish Pub-

lication Society, in the forthcoming new translation of the Bible, were Drs. Kohler, Philipson and Schulman. This committee, reporting at each meeting, was able to announce satisfactory progress in the work.

The board had to act on a very important matter, as follows: Dr. Calisch requested permission for his congregation to insert certain prayers on separate pages in the Union Prayer-Book. The request was granted, with the provisos that these additions must appear in an appendix to each service, not in the body of the service, that prayers contrary to the spirit of the Union Prayer-Book must not be so inserted, and that the book so changed was to be for the sole use of the congregation requesting this permission.

The Executive Board agreed unanimously to recommend to the Conference that hereafter no congregation be granted permission to make any changes whatsoever in the Union Prayer-Book.

The Corresponding Secretary was ordered to send letters to the congregations ministered to by members of the Conference, calling attention to the Superannuated Ministers' Fund, and asking for donations to it.

It was decided to circularize the members on the advisability of postponing the annual meeting until November, when the Conference might in New York duly celebrate the centenary of David Einhorn's birth. Such a large majority voted for this plan that arrangements were immediately made for a later annual meeting. Besides the Einhorn celebration in New York, it was decided to ask Rabbis Rubenstein and Krauskopf to hold in Baltimore and Philadelphia respectively some service commemorative of the Einhorn centenary. In New York Dr. Silverman was asked to arrange for an Adler celebration.

The Executive Committee ordered that all cases of misrepresentation of Jews and Judaism in the public press, or on the public rostrum, be referred for action to the Committee on Church and State.

The Treasurer was ordered to send due-bills to the members three times a year.

One member resigned: Alfred T. Godshaw.

During the year the following new members were admitted into the Conference: Rabbis Louis D. Gross, Louis J. Kopald, David Rosenbaum, Jacob Singer, Samuel Schwarz, Aaron L. Weinstein, Horace J. Wolf, Jacob L. Landau, Bernard D. Kaplan.

The completion of the fifth year of Dr. Kohler's incumbency as President of the Hebrew Union College occurring while the Executive Committee was sitting at its October, 1908, meeting, felicitations and congratulations were extended to the Honorary President of the Conference.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID LEFKOWITZ,

Recording Secretary.

The report of the Treasurer, Rabbi Charles S. Levi, and in connection therewith, the books and vouchers from the Peoria Commercial Bank, where the account is kept, were presented to the Conference, and on motion were received and referred to the Auditing Committee.

REPORT OF TREASURER.

JULY 1, 1908, TO NOVEMBER 1, 1909.

To the Honorables, President, Officers and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

BRETHREN: It affords me great pleasure to present to your distinguished Conference the report of your Treasurer, covering the period of sixteen months, from July, 1908, to November, 1909, and I trust you will find satisfaction in your earnest consideration of the same. It is gratifying to note that, for the first time in the twenty years' endeavors for constructive achievements by the Conference, congregations have begun to contribute to our Tract and Sermonic Literature Fund, as well as to our Superannuated Ministers' Fund. Two hundred and ten dollars were donated to the Tract Fund, two hundred and fifty-nine dollars and seventy-seven cents to the Ministers' Fund last year. No gifts can bless the giver and receiver with richer joys than those which dispel darkness with Jewish wisdom and overcome the helplessness of old age with Philanthropy's heavenly manna. What has been nobly begun by thoughtful congregations should be cheerfully continued, with numerous offerings by all coreligionists of means and generous heart, until the knowledge of our religion and history fills the minds of all truth-seekers and the old age of our faithful Rabbis becomes a haven of well-earned repose, enriched by a glorious golden sunset. But a treasurer must deal in facts, not poetic fancies: so pardon my assumption of the role of Koheleth in this wise assembly, whose works of Chochma fill many a book with a treasury of economic lore.

During the last sixteen months our receipts of dues, interest, sales of publications, and donations from congregations and individuals to our Tract and Ministers' Funds, were \$10,147.54; our expenditures for all purposes, \$7,305.99, thereby increasing our treasury \$2,841.55, raising our total funds from \$18,561.48 to \$21,403.03. Our income from sales of publications was \$7,172.07, the expenditures for new editions and new publications \$3,702.06, showing a balance in our favor of \$3,470.01. The amount of the Ministers' Pension Fund at present is \$17,517.17, being an increase of \$2,861.02 since July, 1908; that of the General Fund is \$3,-

885.86, being a decrease of \$19.47, indicating that our general expenses, which are constantly growing, and must continue to do so if the great historic work of the Conference is to continue in the development of American Judaism, must be provided for more adequately than at present, and that the By-Laws of our Constitution creating the General Fund, from which moneys to pay our general expenses are taken, ought to be revised at once. But for the donation of \$210.00 to the Tract Fund, which I included in the General Fund this year, we would have run short this amount more, which, added to \$703.65, the decrease of the General Fund in 1907-08, shows a diminishing of nearly \$1,000 in two years. All vouchers drawn and all bills presented up to November 1, 1909, have been paid in full.

Dues and Members.

July 1, 1908	Total Membership	202	
	Died during year	4	
	Suspended	8	
	Exempt from paying dues	9	
	Resigned	1	
	Honorary member	1	
Nov. 1, 1909	Total membership	189	
	Number taxed with dues	179	
	Dues paid by 126 members.....		\$1,270.00
	Dues 4 members remitted		65.00
	Dues 8 members suspended		125.00
	Members in arrears, owing \$5 to \$15, up to July, 1909	63	395.00
	Members paid up to July, 1910	41	
	Members paid up to July, 1909	126	
	Members liable to suspension for arrears of two years or more	15	

If all members pay up all dues owing—and this year of prosperity in our congregations is liable to enable us to do so, \$1,085.00 more will be paid into the treasury by July, 1910. It were a consummation devoutly to be wished.

I now present in detail the following summary of all monetary transactions, which will account accurately for all receipts and expenditures during the sixteen months, July 1, 1908, to November 1, 1909:

RECEIPTS.

From Dues and Interest.

July 1, 1908, to Nov. 1, 1909, dues.....	\$ 1,270.00	\$ 1,270.00
June 8, 1909, Int. on \$12,000, one year, to July 1, 1909, at 6%	720.00	
June 22, 1909, Int. on \$4,480, one year, to June 22, 1909, at 3%	134.40	
June 22, 1909, Int. on \$1,200, one year, to June 22, 1909, at 3%	36.00	
June 22, 1909, Int. on \$1,200, Feb. 1, 1909, to June 21, 1909, at 3%	14.10	
Oct. 28, 1909, Int. on \$12,000, July to Nov. 1, 1909, at 6%	240.00	
Nov. 2, 1909, Int. on \$5,680, June 22 to Nov. 2, 1909, at 3%	62.00	
Nov. 2, 1909, Int. on \$1,000, June 15 to Nov. 2, 1909, at 3%	11.50	
Nov. 2, 1909, Int. on \$1,200, June 22 to Nov. 2, 1909, at 3%	13.10	\$ 1,231.10

From Sales of Publications.

Aug. 24, 1908, Bloch Publishing Company.....	\$ 250.00	
Aug. 24, 1908, Bloch Publishing Company.....	200.00	
Sept. 24, 1908, Bloch Publishing Company.....	500.00	
Oct. 26, 1908, Bloch Publishing Company.....	500.00	
Nov. 13, 1908, Bloch Publishing Company.....	600.00	
Nov. 30, 1908, Bloch Publishing Company.....	750.00	
Dec. 22, 1908, Bloch Publishing Company.....	500.00	
Jan. 5, 1909, Bloch Publishing Company.....	750.00	
Feb. 1, 1909, Bloch Publishing Company.....	625.00	
Mar. 1, 1909, Bloch Publishing Company.....	275.00	
Apr. 8, 1909, Bloch Publishing Company.....	300.00	
Apr. 8, 1909, Free Synagog, New York.....	75.00	
May 12, 1909, Bloch Publishing Company.....	150.00	
June 3, 1909, Bloch Publishing Company.....	250.00	
June 15, 1909, Bloch Publishing Company.....	247.07	
Aug. 31, 1909, Bloch Publishing Company.....	200.00	
Sept. 28, 1909, Bloch Publishing Company.....	400.00	
Oct. 6, 1909, Bloch Publishing Company.....	200.00	
Oct. 21, 1909, Bloch Publishing Company.....	400.00	\$ 7,172.07

From Donations to Ministers' Fund.

Aug. 24, 1908, L. & M. Altheimer	\$	100.00	
Sept. 24, 1908, Milwaukee Reform Congregation...		50.00	
Sept. 24, 1908, Summer Congregation of Frankfort	109.77	\$	259.77

From Donations to Tract Fund and General Fund.

May 12, 1909, Temple Israel, Cincinnati.....	\$	25.00.	
May 12, 1909, Adath Israel, Louisville.....		25.00	
June 3, 1909, Dr. S. Wolfenstein.....		10.00	
June 9, 1909, Temple Beth-El, New York.....		25.00	
June 9, 1909, J. Morgenstern, Secretary.....		8.50	
June 9, 1909, Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation.		10.00	
June 15, 1909, Temple Israel, Omaha.....		10.00	
June 15, 1909, Oakland Hebrew Congregation....		10.00	
July 8, 1909, Detroit Reform Congregation.....		10.00	
July 8, 1909, Beth Ahava Cong., Richmond.....		10.00	
Sept. 28, 1909, G. A. Levi, Victoria, Texas.....		1.50	
Oct. 21, 1909, J. Morgenstern, Secretary.....		50.00	
Nov. 2, 1909, Keneseth Israel Cong., Phila.	15.00	\$	210.00
<hr/>			
June 15, 1909, General Expense Refunded.....			4.60
<hr/>			
Nov. 1, 1909, Total Receipts			\$10,147.54

EXPENDITURES.

On Account of Publications.

July 7, 1908, Williams & Co., binding 100 P. B. Vols. I and II.	\$	75.00
July 8, 1908, Stettiner & Co., Week-day Services.	100.00	
Oct. 27, 1908, Publishers' Printing Co., printing 5,400 Vols. I, II; binding 2,993 Vols. I, II; printing 2,000 Sab- baths; binding 1,004 Sabbaths...	1,144.92	
Dec. 8, 1908, Williams & Co., binding, less over- charge	314.04	
Dec. 4, 1908, Stettiner Bros., printing Haftaroeth	315.00	
Dec. 4, 1908, William C. Popper, bal. on Hymnals	142.64	
Dec. 21, 1908, Publishers' Printing Co., binding 1,004 Sabbaths, 5 boxes.....	81.56	

Dec. 21, 1908, Morris Rose, insurance of \$2,000 on plates	20.38	
Jan. 15, 1909, Marcus Katz, ins. on Haggadoth	2.00	
Mar. 9, 1909, Murphy, Parker & Co., binding 500 Haggadoth, 1 case	38.50	
Mar. 18, 1909, Publishers' Printing Co., 2,000 Hymnals, 5,000 Sabbaths, plate corrections	514.41	
Mar. 18, 1909, Williams & Co., binding 708 Week-day Services	56.64	
Mar. 18, 1909, Simon Wolf, ins. on Haggadoth	2.97	
June 1, 1909, Marcus Katz & Son, insurance of \$500 on Haggadoth	2.97	
June 10, 1909, Publishers' Printing Co., binding 125 P. B.	75.00	
June 17, 1909, Publishers' Printing Co., binding 150 Vol. II	90.00	
Oct. 20, 1909, Publishers' Printing Co., binding 2,000 Vols. I, II; 512 Sabbaths; 500 Vols. I, II; 77 packages; folding 100 Vol. II	597.90	
Oct. 20, 1909, Publishers' Printing Co., 992 Vol. II, 23 packages	123.13	\$ 3,702.06

On Account of General Expenses.

July 7, 1908, The Mailing and Advertising Co., for Tract I	\$ 2.44
July 7, 1908, C. J. Krehbiel & Co., printing 500 programs	15.00
July 7, 1908, J. Morgenstern, postage, repairs typewriter	13.54
July 7, 1908, D. Lefkowitz, postage circulars	9.65
July 9, 1908, Central Trust Co., rent of space	6.75
July 9, 1908, J. Morgenstern, exp. to Frankfort	51.90
July 9, 1908, J. Morgenstern, office exp. July	25.00
July 9, 1908, Ehrlich subvention	50.00
July 9, 1908, C. J. Krehbiel & Co., printing	10.75
Aug. 22, 1908, L. B. Case, reporting Conference proceedings	80.00
Aug. 22, 1908, J. Morgenstern, August office expenses, expressage	26.15
Sept. 22, 1908, C. J. Krehbiel & Co., stationery	4.25

Sept. 22, 1908, David Philipson, exp. in New York.	13.80
Sept. 22, 1908, J. Morgenstern, office exp. Sept....	25.00
Sept. 22, 1908, D. Lefkowitz, Year-Book expenses..	2.50
Oct. 20, 1908, C. J. Krehbiel & Co., printing 1,000 circulars and messages	39.35
Oct. 20, 1908, T. Rubovitz, mailing, postage, 287 sermon leaflets	7.74
Oct. 20, 1908, S. E. Tate, printing 1,000 holiday sermons	60.00
Oct. 20, 1908, J. Morgenstern, October expenses..	25.00
Nov. 5, 1908, C. J. Krehbiel & Co., 29 plates.....	16.15
Nov. 5, 1908, S. Schulman, expenses to Cincinnati meeting	53.00
Nov. 5, 1908, I. L. Rypins, expenses to Cincinnati meeting	40.00
Nov. 5, 1908, S. Hirshberg, expenses to Cincinnati meeting	24.00
Nov. 5, 1908, M. Heller, expenses to Cincinnati meeting	53.40
Nov. 5, 1908, C. S. Levi, office expense and ex- penses to Cincinnati meeting.....	37.50
Nov. 5, 1908, A. Guttmacher, expenses to Cincinnati meeting	38.00
Nov. 5, 1908, L. M. Franklin, mailing 1,000 pros- pectus	10.00
Nov. 5, 1908, American Press, printing 1,000 pros- pectus, circulars, envelopes	29.50
Nov. 5, 1908, Phoenix Club, luncheon Executive Committee	11.40
Nov. 5, 1908, D. Philipson, expense for Executive Committee dinner	11.00
Nov. 5, 1908, J. Morgenstern, office exp. November	28.00
Nov. 5, 1908, Joseph Stolz, expenses to Cincinnati meeting	16.00
Nov. 9, 1908, H. G. Enelow, expenses to Cincinnati meeting	15.00
Nov. 9, 1908, J. Morgenstern, postage 5,000 Tracts No. I	50.00
Dec. 4, 1908, Mailing and Advertising Co., mail- ing Tract I.....	8.03
Dec. 4, 1908, M. J. Gries, expenses Cincinnati meeting	12.40
Dec. 4, 1908, D. Lefkowitz, expenses Cincinnati meeting, typing minutes.....	3.80

Dec. 4, 1908, J. Morgenstern, December expenses of office	25.00
Dec. 4, 1908, C. S. Levi, postage, expressage.....	5.65
Dec. 21, 1908, C. J. Krehbiel & Co., printing 10,000 Tracts I, 5,000 envelopes and postals	69.75
Dec. 21, 1908, C. A. Rubenstein, domestic service expenses	11.65
Jan. 15, 1909, J. Morgenstern, January expenses.	25.00
Feb. 16, 1909, Edgar Daniels, typing minutes.....	7.14
Feb. 16, 1909, J. Morgenstern, expenses to Philadelphia and of office.....	57.00
Feb. 28, 1909, J. Morgenstern, postage 840 Year Books	95.00
Mar. 9, 1909, Prof. D. Neumark, subvention of book	50.00
Mar. 9, 1909, J. Morgenstern, March expenses...	25.00
Mar. 18, 1909, S. Rosenthal, printing 1,000 Year Books	699.54
Mar. 18, 1909, Mailing and Advertising Co., 788 Year Books	5.26
Apr. 8, 1909, D. Philipson, postage, typing.....	5.00
Apr. 8, 1909, J. Morgenstern, postage tracts, April expenses	106.00
Apr. 8, 1909, Gibbon, Dickelman, for bond of Treasurer	20.00
June 1, 1909, Mailing and Advertising Co., 319 postals and printing	6.39
June 1, 1909, J. Morgenstern, office expenses May.	25.00
June 10, 1909, C. J. Krehbiel & Co., 10,000 envelopes and Tracts No. II.....	97.00
June 10, 1909, J. D. Eisenstein, 3 Vols. III Encyclopedia	9.00
June 10, 1909, J. Morgenstern, postage and mailing 4,400 tracts	41.40
June 10, 1909, J. Morgenstern, June expenses.....	25.00
June 17, 1909, C. S. Levi, postage.....	8.40
June 17, 1909, D. Marx, expenses to Cincinnati meeting	25.00
June 17, 1909, C. J. Krehbiel & Co., 10,000 Tracts No. II, 2d ed.	59.00
Aug. 31, 1909, Edgar Daniels, minutes of meeting.	2.17
Aug. 31, 1909, Mailing and Advertising Co., mailing tracts	1.90

Aug. 31, 1909, Central Trust & Safe Deposit Co., space rent	6.75	
Aug. 31, 1909, J. Morgenstern, July-Aug. expenses.	50.00	
Sept. 28, 1909, J. Morgenstern, Sept. expenses....	25.00	
Oct. 20, 1909, Louis Wolsey, Expense Committee.	19.75	
Oct. 20, 1909, Starchroom Publishing Co., 400 circ.	2.25	
Oct. 20, 1909, S. E. Tate, printing holiday sermons	58.00	
Oct. 20, 1909, Multi-Letter Shop, stenography, postage, mailing	8.15	
Oct. 20, 1909, J. Morgenstern, October expenses...	25.00	
Oct. 20, 1909, Starchroom Pub. Co., printing, ad- dressing, mailing	11.03	
Oct. 20, 1909, D. Philipson, postage, typing, tele- grams	10.00	
Oct. 28, 1909, American Press, printing 800 blanks, letters	4.50	
Oct. 28, 1909, C. S. Levi, expenses, postage, print- ing, typing	29.50	
Oct. 28, 1909, Leo. M. Franklin, postage Lyceum Bureau	4.00	
Oct. 28, 1909, Bloch Publishing Co., book for S.-S. Committee	3.45	\$ 2,690.63

On Account of Ministers' Pensions.

July 1, 1908, to November 1, 1909.....	\$ 913.30	913.30
Total Expenditures		\$ 7,305.99

SUMMARY OF FUNDS.

July 1, 1908, Total funds in treasury.....	\$18,561.48
July 1, 1908, to November 1, 1909, total receipts.....	10,147.54
July 1, 1908, to November 1, 1909, total expenditures.....	7,305.99
Nov. 1, 1909, total funds	21,403.03
Nov. 1, 1909, net increase of funds	2,841.55

GENERAL FUND.

To this fund is transferred one-half of the dues, of the net profits from publications, and of interest on moneys, other than the Ministers' Fund; also donations to the Tract Fund.

Receipts.

July 1, 1908, balance of fund		\$ 3,905.33
June 15, 1909, postage refunded	\$ 4.60	
Nov. 1, 1909, dues of members	635.00	
Nov. 1, 1909, interest	86.55	
Nov. 1, 1909, proceeds of publications.....	1,735.01	
Nov. 1, 1909, donations to tracts	210.00	\$ 2,671.16

Expenditures.

July 1, 1908, to Nov. 1, 1909, general expenses...	\$ 2,690.63	
July 1, 1908, to Nov. 1, 1909, decrease of fund...	19.47	
Nov. 1, 1909, amount of fund		\$ 3,885.86

MINISTERS' RELIEF FUND.

To this fund is transferred one-half of the dues, of the net proceeds of publications, and of the interest of the General Fund, besides the entire interest on the investment and special donations thereto.

Receipts.

July 1, 1908, amount of fund		\$14,656.15
Nov. 1, 1909, dues of members	\$ 635.00	
Nov. 1, 1909, interest	1,144.55	
Nov. 1, 1909, proceeds of publications.....	1,735.00	
Nov. 1, 1909, donations	259.77	\$ 3,774.32

Expenditures.

July 1, 1908, to Nov. 1, 1909, pensions.....	\$ 913.30	\$ 913.30
Nov. 1, 1909, increase of fund	2,861.02	
Nov. 1, 1909, total fund		\$17,517.17
Nov. 1, 1909, General and Ministers' Funds.....		21,403.03

Investments.

Nov. 1, 1909, building bonds at 6%	\$12,000.00	
Nov. 2, 1909, certificates of deposit at 3%	7,880.00	
Nov. 1, 1909, balance in Com. Ger. Natl. Bank..	1,523.03	\$21,403.03

I present in connection with this sixteen months' report the books, vouchers, receipts and certificates of deposit, held in trust, and the statement of the Commercial German National Bank of Peoria, which never charges exchange on checks sent us. In conclusion, let me extend my heartfelt appreciation to the Conference for the office of trust and confidence with which you have honored your Treasurer these ten years.

I trust my successor will enjoy the pleasure of keeping two hundred Rabbis straight in their accounts as much as I have.

With best wishes for the golden progress of our institution, I remain,

Most respectfully,

CHARLES S. LEVI,

Treasurer.

The report of the Publication Committee was then read by its Chairman, Rabbi Adolph Guttmacher, and on motion was received and referred to the Auditing Committee.

REPORT OF PUBLICATION COMMITTEE.

NEW YORK, Nov. 10, 1909.

The Publication Committee, charged by the C. C. A. R. with the publication and handling of its publications, begs leave to submit the following report for the sixteen months, from June 1, 1908, to Sept. 30, 1909.

Since the last meeting of the Conference at Frankfort, the Prayer Book has been adopted, either as a whole or in part, by 15 congregations. It is gratifying to note, that 276 congregations, and a large number of public institutions, use the Union Prayer Book. The slight decrease in the sale of the book is due to natural conditions. The larger congregations have introduced the Prayer Book several years ago, and the congregations that now introduce it are mostly the newly organized bodies in the smaller communities. With few exceptions, the Union Prayer Book is used by all the members of the Conference. The popularity of the book may be gleaned from the fact that 104,321 copies of it have been sold during 15 years.

To our agents, the Bloch Publishing Co., New York, publications to the value of \$17,569.74 were delivered during the time covered by this report, viz.:

Prayer Books—*Volume I.*—Cloth, 1994; leather, 597; morocco, 100; extra morocco, 394. Total, 3085.

Volume II.—Cloth, 3161; leather, 500; morocco, 150; extra morocco, 273. Total, 4084.

Sabbath Eve and Morning Services, 3520; Union Hymnals, 1000; Union Haggadahs, 500; Year Books—paper, 737; bound, 86.

We expended for printing, \$1166.60; for binding, \$2467.14; for insurance, \$28.32; for reading of plates of Prayer Books for corrections, \$40.00.

The following publications amounting to \$8,964.27 were sold, viz.:

Prayer Books—*Volume I.*—Cloth, 2490; leather, 584; morocco, 113; extra morocco, 357. Total, 3544.

Volume II.—Cloth, 4087; leather, 619; morocco, 110; extra morocco, 231. Total, 5047.

Sabbath Eve and Morning Services, 3297; Week-day Services, 334; Union Hymnals, 2597.

Union Haggadahs—cloth, 1095; cloth gilt, 27; limp leather, 4. Total, 1126.

Sermons, cloth, 12; Margolis Reprint, 1; Views on the Synod, 15; Year Books—paper, 256; cloth, 46.

The remittances amounted to \$8250.45.

Publications of the Conference, sent by agent upon the orders of President and Secretary, charged back to the Conference at actual cost with charges for transportation (Exhibit F) \$1153.38.

In addition to the stock inventory (vide Exhibit B) we have on hand at Bloch Publishing Co. 408 Sunday Service Books (unbound); at Publishers' Printing Co., New York, Prayer Books (unbound) Vol. I, 3000; Vol. II, 680; Union Hymnals (unbound) 1000; Sabbath Eve and Morning Services (unbound) 2500.

At Murphy, Parker & Co., Philadelphia, 1000 Haggadahs (unbound).

The plates of all our publications have been insured and placed in the vaults of the Publishers' Printing Co., New York.

We subjoin the reports of the Bloch Publishing Company, our agents, who have been most faithful in the performance of their duties.

Respectfully submitted,

S. FOSTER.

S. H. GOLDENSON,

M. H. HARRIS,

MARTIN A. MEYER,

A. GUTTMACHER,

Chairman.

JUNE 9, 1909.

Dr. A. Guttmacher, Chairman Publication Committee, C. C. A. R.

DEAR SIR:—As requested, we submit herewith the annual detailed statement of account of our dealings with your honored body, following the style of the previous reports.

The total sales, compared with those of last year, show a falling off of about \$500.00, due principally to a decreased sale of the Prayer Books. This might have due, in part, to the general business depression, which affects congregations as well as commercial houses, and should not be attributed to a decreasing use of the book. On the contrary, it is our firm belief that the book is being introduced in a larger number of congregations each year, gaining ground even among the more conservative congregations. In addition to this, we notice that individuals living in communi-

ties far from any organized congregation, are ordering the book in larger numbers each year. We use every effort to bring the book to the notice of such congregations that contemplate a change in ritual, and we have reason to believe that the sale for the coming year will show a decided increase.

The sale of the Haggadah was about the same as last year, although we sent out not less than 10,000 circulars to that many individuals. We would suggest that the members of the Conference recommend to their congregations that they purchase a certain quantity of the Haggadah each season and either distribute or sell them to their members. By this means, the books would be brought to the personal notice of a large number of people.

Although you instructed us to transfer the Margolis and Kohler Reprints to the list of free publications, we deferred doing so until the end of the fiscal year, so as not to confuse the accounts. With June 1 we are charging back 413 Margolis and 18 Kohler Reprints, at the prices charged to us. This transfer will appear in the next detailed report.

Through an error in stock taking last season, a case containing paper bound sermons was overlooked. This will explain why the number of copies on hand this season exceeds the number reported last year.

You will notice the large number of Year Books and Sermons which are still on hand. We doubt whether we sold for cash, during the past year, five copies of either of these books. The quantities shown on the Sales Sheet (see Exhibit C), were sent out gratis, on orders from the Executive Committee, and hence do not represent cash sales. We would again urge upon you the desirability of placing these books on the free list, that is, that they be taken from the list of books for which a charge is made and be given gratuitously to those who request them through the Executive Committee.

A very large number of pamphlets, tracts, Year Books, etc., were ordered to be sent out, by the Committee during the past season (see Exhibit F). All these orders were given prompt and careful attention and no charge whatever made for our work in connection therewith. The charges shown, represent the value of the books as charged to us by the Conference and such delivery charges as were incurred in forwarding the packages.

In connection with the foregoing, we would state that we have deferred preparing a circular of the Conference publications that are distributed gratuitously, in the hope that some action will be taken regarding the Year Books and Sermons. Our intention is to prepare such a circular, giving a complete list of all volumes that may be obtained free, excepting that the postage should be prepaid by the party ordering, so as to save the Conference the expense of delivery. All requests should come through the Executive Committee or its representative. We believe

that there are many libraries and ministers who would gladly pay the postage on all the free publications of the Conference.

We have on hand over 400 copies of the booklet of Holiday Sermons issued last season. Our records show that less than 100 individuals apply for these Sermons, hence we suggest that some disposition be made of those now on hand and if a new series is issued this season, that the number printed be considerably reduced.

On inquiry, we learned from the Publishers' Printing Co., that it has on hand an ample number of unbound copies of the various Prayer Books and Hymnal, and hence there will be no need for printing any books this season.

We acknowledge with pleasure and many thanks the kindness and courtesy extended to us by your Committee and the Officers of the Conference, and we accept same as an indication of your good will and of your satisfaction with the work we are endeavoring to do. We sincerely hope that the services we render, merit the renewal of our contract and earnestly trust that this will be granted.

Very truly yours,

BLOCH PUBLISHING Co.,

CHAS. E. BLOCH, *Prop.*

EXHIBIT A.

BOOKS RECEIVED JUNE 1, 1908-MAY 31, 1909.

1908

June 30—	100 Union Prayer Books. I, leather.....	\$1.05	\$105.00
July 14—	497 Union Prayer Books. I, leather.....	1.05	521.85
Aug. 19—	169 Union Prayer Books, I, extra mor.....	1.75	295.75
Aug. 19—	123 Union Prayer Books, II, extra mor.....	1.75	215.25
Aug. 19—	300 Union Prayer Books, II, leather.....	1.05	315.00
Aug. 25—	498 Union Prayer Books, I, cloth.....	.70	348.60
Aug. 25—	178 Union Prayer Books, II, cloth.....	.70	124.60
Aug. 25—	50 Union Prayer Books, II, morocco.....	1.40	70.00
Sept. 10—	1000 Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	175.00
Sept. 10—	502 Union Prayer Books, II, cloth.....	.70	351.40
Sept. 15—	532 Union Prayer Books, II, cloth.....	.70	372.40
Sept. 22—	500 Union Prayer Books, II, cloth.....	.70	350.00
Sept. 29—	458 Union Prayer Books, II, cloth.....	.70	320.60
Nov. 21—	326 Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	57.05
Nov. 23—	678 Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	118.65

1909.

Feb. 9—	1004 Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	175.70
---------	---------------------------------------	------	--------

Feb. 17— 960 Union Hymnal30	288.00
Feb. 19— 40 Union Hymnal30	12.00
Mar. 8— 73 Year Book, paper35	25.55
Mar. 8— 86 Year Book, bound.....	.70	60.20
Apr. 2— 500 Union Prayer Books, I, cloth.....	.70	350.00
Apr. 5— 500 Union Prayer Books, I, cloth.....	.70	350.00
Apr. 15— 500 Union Haggadah17½	87.50
May 4— 125 Union Prayer Books, I, extra mor.....	\$1.75	\$218.75
May 28— 100 Union Prayer Books, II, extra mor.....	1.75	175.00
May 28— 50 Union Prayer Books, II, extra mor.....	1.75	87.50
		<hr/>
		\$5,571.35
July 14, 1908—Mdse. returned.....		129.40
September 30, 1908—Mdse. returned.....		13.00
		<hr/>
Total		\$5,713.75
Stock on Hand May 30, 1908 (see page 44 of Year Book, 1908)		\$4,977.46
		<hr/>
Grand total		\$10,691.21

EXHIBIT B.

STOCK INVENTORY, MAY 31, 1909.

928 Union Prayer Books, I, cloth	\$.70	\$649.60
284 Union Prayer Books, I, leather	1.05	298.20
38 Union Prayer Books, I, morocco	1.40	53.20
96 Union Prayer Books, I, extra morocco	1.75	168.00
292 Union Prayer Books, II, cloth70	204.40
266 Union Prayer Books, II, leather	1.05	279.30
364 Union Prayer Books, II, leather, <i>old</i> edition.....	1.05	382.20
24 Union Prayer Books, II, morocco	1.40	33.60
171 Union Prayer Books, II, extra morocco	1.75	299.25
83 Union Prayer Books, II, extra morocco, <i>old</i> edition.	1.75	145.25
262 Sabbath Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	45.85
637 Week Day Service.....	.17½	111.48
986 Union Hymnal30	295.80
560 Union Haggadah, cloth.....	.17½	98.00
363 Union Haggadah, cloth gilt35	127.05
196 Union Haggadah, limp leather.....	.70	137.20
1293 Year Book, paper.....	.35	452.55

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS.

49

305 Year Books, cloth70	213.50
18 Views on the Synod35	6.30
413 Margolis, reprint.....	.35	144.55
797 Sermons, paper.....	.25	199.25
23 Sermons, cloth.....	.85	19.55
Total		<hr/> \$4,364.08

EXHIBIT C.

SALES FROM JUNE 1, 1908-MAY 31, 1909.

1542 Union Prayer Books, I, cloth.....	\$.70	\$1079.40
389 Union Prayer Books, I, leather.....	1.05	408.45
79 Union Prayer Books, I, morocco.....	1.40	110.60
279 Union Prayer Books, I, extra morocco.....	1.75	488.25
2430 Union Prayer Books, II, cloth.....	.70	1701.00
350 Union Prayer Books, II, leather.....	1.05	367.50
84 Union Prayer Books, II, morocco.....	1.40	117.60
168 Union Prayer Books, II, extra morocco.....	1.75	294.00
2746 Sabbath Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	480.55
324 Week Day Service17½	56.70
2136 Union Hymnal30	640.80
1095 Union Haggadah, cloth.....	.17½	191.64
27 Union Haggadah, cloth gilt.....	.35	9.45
4 Union Haggadah, limp leather.....	.70	2.80
12 Sermons, cloth.....	.85	10.20
1 Margolis, Reprint.....	.35	.35
15 Views on the Synod.....	.35	5.25
244 Year Books, paper.....	.35	85.40
44 Year Books, cloth.....	.70	30.80
Total		<hr/> \$6,080.74

EXHIBIT D.

MONTHLY SALES.

1908—June-October	\$ 4,055.75
November	274.93
December	341.42
1909—January	151.75
February	268.73
March	264.98

April	194.33
May	396.85
Total	<u>\$5,948.74</u>
Balance due from June 1, 1908.....	975.10
Grand Total	<u>\$6,923.84</u>

REMITTANCES.

June 25, 1908	\$250.00
August 22, 1908	200.00
September 19, 1908.....	500.00
October 17, 1908.....	500.00
November 10, 1908.....	600.00
November 28, 1908.....	750.00
December 12, 1908.....	500.00
December 31, 1908.....	750.00
January 27, 1909.....	625.00
February 20, 1909.....	275.00
March 27, 1909	300.00
April 28, 1909.....	150.00
May 29, 1909.....	250.00
June 9, 1909	247.07
Total	<u>\$5,897.07</u>
Charged to Conference (see Exhibit F).....	\$ 813.98
	<u>\$6,711.05</u>

EXHIBIT E.

SUMMARY.

Balance due Conference June 1, 1908.....	\$ 975.10
Value of Books received, etc., (see Exhibit A).....	10,691.21
	<u>\$11,666.31</u>
Stock on Hand (Exhibit B).....	4,364.08
Cash Remittances (Exhibit D).....	5,897.07
Charged to Conference (Exhibit F)	813.98
Total	<u>\$11,075.13</u>
Balance due	\$ 591.18
Above balance represents the sales of April and May.	

EXHIBIT F.

BOOKS, ETC., CHARGED TO THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF
AMERICAN RABBIS.

The following items consist of books sent out on orders from the Conference. Everything is charged back to the Conference at the actual cost.

1908

June 11	Postage on Tract No. I.....	\$.25
25	To Krehbiel & Co.: 1 U. P. Book, 70c.; 1 at \$1.05; 1 at \$1.40; 1 at \$1.75; Hag. at 18c. and express 37c.....	5.45
25	To Frankfort Conference: 100 U. P. Books, \$70.00; 100 Hymnals, \$30.00; 1 set Year Books, \$4.55; 6 Year Books, '07, \$2.10; express, \$7.84.....	114.49
25	From Philadelphia: Express on Haggadah plates.....	.75
29	To G. C. Goldstein: 1 Year Book.....	.70
29	To Rev. F. Braun: 1 Year Book and postage.....	.80
29	To I. Kaplan: 1 Sermons25
29	Postage on Tract I (various requests).....	.22
29	To E. S. Curtis: Syn., Year Books, Aspects and post....	1.30
July 2	Rebate on 86 U. P. Bks. at 15c. (Jew. O. Asy. Cleveland)	12.90
14	Express on books returned from Frankfort Conference....	7.80
15	To Rev. D. Marx: 12 U. P. Bks. 70c.; 12 Hymnals, 30c.; 12 Year Bks. (1 cloth), \$4.55; express, \$1.65.....	18.20
16	To Dr. Philipson: 1 Year Book.....	.35
31	To Dr. Silverman: 25 U. P. Bks., 70c.; 10 Hymnals, 30c..	20.50
31	To Publishers' Print. Co.: Set clo. U. P. Bks., 1 Sab. Eve.	1.58
31	Expr. on samples to printers in Balt. and Chicago.....	.88
31	To Benj. Laas: Sermons and postage.....	.35
31	To Silver: Year Book and postage.....	.85
31	Postage on 163 Tract I.....	.78
Aug. 17	Rebate on 12 U. P. Bks. at 10c. (Chicago Jew. O. Asy.).	1.20
Sept. 1	Rebate on 435 mor. U. P. Bks. chgd. to leather at 35c....	152.25
5	Postage during August on Tract I38
8	Expr. on Holiday Sermons from Milwaukee.....	4.40
10	Expr. on Holiday Sermons to Rubovitz, Chicago.....	2.35
10	To Dr. Deutsch: 50 U. P. Bks. lea., II, \$52.50; rubber stamp, 50c. and expr. \$1.20	54.20
11	To N. J. State Prison (Stern): 46 U. P. Bks., II, cloth, \$32.20; 4 U. P. Bks., lea., II, \$4.20; expr., 55c.....	36.95
14	To Dr. Philipson: U. P. Bk., 70c.; Sab. Ev., 18c.; expr., 10c.	.98
17	To Dr. Blum: 75 Sab. Eve., Service.....	13.13

	17 To Home for Jew. Friendless, Chicago: 50 sets clo. U. P. Bks., \$70.00; 25 Hymnals, \$7.50.....	77.50
	18 Expr. on Holiday Sermons from Rubovitz.....	1.10
	18 Rebate on 36 clo. U. P. Bks. (Brooklyn H. O. A.) at 10c.....	3.60
	22 To Eastern N. Y. Reformatory: 12 U.P. Bks., I, clo., \$8.40; 30 U. P. Bks., clo., II, \$21.00; expr. 60c.....	30.00
	23 Brooklyn Jew. Hospital: 25 U. P. Bks., II, clo., \$17.50; dispatch, 40c.; expr. 20c.....	18.10
	24 To Dr. J. Norden, Germany: 3 sets U. P. Bks., \$4.20; postage, 65c.	\$4.85
Oct.	6 Distributed during September per Dr. Morgenstern: 29 Yr. Bks., pap.; 3 Yr. Bk., clo.; 3 Aspects; 2 Synod; 3 Sermons; postage on Tract I and Holiday Sermons; expr. and post. on above.....	20.11
	7 Freight and drayage on books returned from Frankfort..	1.35
	16 To Bontelji, Amsterdam, & Jued. Les. Berlin: 2 sets U. P. Bks. \$2.80; 2 Haggadahs, 35c.; 2 Hymnals, 60c.; 2 Aspects, 70c.; 2 Sermons, 50c.; 2 Synod, 70c.; 24 Year Books (2 clo.), \$9.10; postage, \$2.95.....	17.70
Nov.	9 Postage on Tracts and Holiday Sermons during October.	3.10
	9 To Rev. Freund: 30 Sab. Eve., \$5.25; expr. 95c. (70 Tr.)	6.20
	10 To Rabbi Levy, etc.: 22 Yr. Bks., pap.,; 2 Yr., clo.; 2 Sermons; 2 Synod; 1 Aspects; post. \$1.08.....	11.43
Dec.	1 Petty Charges: Postage, expr. during November.....	8.81
	17 To Wm. Stiassny: 12 Yr. Bks., (1 clo.); set Clo. U. P. Bks.; 1 Sermons; postage, \$1.40.....	8.20
	19 Clo. Yr. Bk. and postage to Dr. Hirsch, 84c.; to Kornfeld: 12 clo. U. P. Bks., \$8.40; expr., 81c.....	10.05
	22 To Newark Heb. O. Asy.: 50 Sab. Eve., \$8.75; 50 Hymnal, \$15.00; expr., 50c.	24.25
	31 Postage, expr., etc., through the month.....	.96
	31 To Dr. Blum: 50 Week Day.....	8.75
1909		
Jan.	21 To M. Bamberger: 6 Yr. Bks., '06.....	2.10
	28 To Dr. Morgenstern: Yr. Bk., clo., and postage.....	.83
	30 Postage, etc., during January.....	1.48
Feb.	8 To Dr. Margolis, etc.: 2 clo. Yr. Bks.; 11 pap.; 1 Aspect; 1 Synod; expr. 60c.....	6.20
	11 To Dr. Collins: Set Pr. Bks., \$1.40; post. 15c.; defective Flex. Mor. Pr. Bks., expr. and lettering, \$2.05.....	3.60
	27 To University College: 12 Yr. Bks., (1 clo.) \$4.55; 1 Synod; 1 Aspects; 1 Sermons; postage, \$1.15; postage on Tracts, 9c.....	6.74
Mar.	11 Expr. on 300 Sunday Service to Free Synagog.....	.55

CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS. 53

15 To Copyright office; Yr. Bk., clo., and postage.....	.82
22 Freight and drayage from Rosenthal, Murphy, etc....	3.93
8 To Rabbis Levi, Bernstein, etc.: Yr. Bks., Aspects, Synods, etc., postage and expressage	21.38
19 To Felsenthal, Feuerlicht, etc.: Year Books, etc., post. and expr.....	25.15
24 To Chicago Jew. O. Asy.,: 18 Haggadahs.....	3.15
26 To Dr. Philipson: Flex. Pr. Bk., \$1.75; to Dr. Singer, 1 Sermons, 85c.	\$2.60
29 To Dr. Wintner, Rubowitz, etc.: Year, Bks. Sermons, etc., expr. and postage	5.77
Apr. 2 To Hyamson & Feldman: Year Book. clo.: Synod, etc.;.	2.08
16 To Bloom, Felsenthal, etc.: 4 Yr. Bk., clo., postage on pamphlets and Tracts.....	3.93
29 To Mikolas, Myers, etc.: Yr. Bks., Sermons, etc.; post, on Tracts and expr.	2.37
May 14 Post. and expr. on Tracts, etc.; 6 clo, Yr. Bks., etc., to Lemann, etc.	6.13
29 Postage on Tracts, etc.; defective Flex. Pr.	4.87
Total	\$ 813.98

EXHIBIT G.

NEW CONGREGATIONS.

The Union Prayer Book has been introduced in the following congregations since June 1, 1908:

Hannibal, Mo.
Asheville, N. C.
Marshall, Texas.
New Rochelle, N. Y.
Springfield, Ohio.
Jefferson, Texas.

(PART II.)

San Bernardino, Calif.
Easton, Pa.
Tacoma, Wash.

Pittsburg, Pa. (Cong. Tree of Life) (Sab. Eve.)

OCT. 21, 1909.

Dr. A. Guttmacher, Chairman Publication Committee, C. C. A. R.

DEAR SIR:—In response to your request for a supplementary report covering the months of June, July, August and September, we are sending herewith such an itemized statement. It is to be used in connection with the report submitted to you early in June and which covered the previous twelve months.

There has been a decrease in the sales of the Prayer Book this season from that of last year, but this is due to causes over which we have no control. The older congregations are not ordering in large quantities and very few new congregations have adopted the book, only one of these being of any consequence. Nearly every large congregation in the country is using the Union Prayer Book, the principal exceptions being in Chicago, Pittsburg and Philadelphia. Hence such congregations that now introduce the book are either the newly organized bodies in smaller communities or the occasional change by a conservative congregation. We would again call attention to the large number of Year Books and Sermons still on hand and again ask that these be taken from the list of books, for which a charge is made. An accounting will be kept of them just the same and none will be given out unless upon an order from the proper officials.

After definite account is taken of this matter at the coming Conference, we shall prepare a circular of all the Conference publications, which we will distribute freely according to the direction and plan of the Publication Committee. In this connection we call your attention to the paragraph on the matter in our letter of last June.

The Publishers' Printing Co. has been instructed to send you a list of unbound copies of the various publications it issues for you. We believe there is sufficient of everything on hand to meet present wants. We are as conservative as possible in having books put into bindings, so that there need not be any idle stock, and so that you are not called upon to pay for the binding long before the books can be sold.

We hope to have the pleasure of meeting the Committee in person when it gathers at the Conference next month and at which time matters in detail can be discussed and decided.

Thanking you again for the pleasant relations that exist between us and the Conference, we are,

Sincerely yours,

BLOCH PUBLISHING Co.,

CHAS. E. BLOCH, *Prop.*

EXHIBIT A.

BOOKS RECEIVED JUNE 1, 1909-SEPT. 30, 1909.

1909.

Aug. 18— 500 Union Prayer Books, II, cloth.....	\$.70	\$350.00
Aug. 18— 512 Evening and Morning Service17½	89.60
Aug. 18— 100 Union Prayer Books, I, extra mor.....	1.75	175.00
Aug. 18— 200 Union Prayer Books, II, leather.....	1.05	210.00
Aug. 18— 100 Union Prayer Books, I, morocco.....	1.40	140.00
Aug. 18— 100 Union Prayer Books, II, morocco.....	1.40	140.00
Sept. 8— 500 Union Prayer Books, II, cloth.....	.70	350.00
Sept. 14— 500 Union Prayer Books, II, cloth.....	.70	350.00
Sept. 23— 491 Union Prayer Books, II, cloth.....	.70	343.70
Sept. 27— 496 Union Prayer Books, I, cloth.....	.70	347.20
		<hr/>
		\$2495.50
June 18, 1909—Mdse. returned.....		18.95
		<hr/>
Total		2514.45
Stock on hand May 31, 1909.....		4364.08
		<hr/>
Grand Total		\$6878.53

EXHIBIT B.

STOCK INVENTORY, SEPT. 30, 1909.

1909.

476 Union Prayer Book, I, cloth.....	\$.70	\$333.20
89 Union Prayer Book, I; leather.....	1.05	93.45
104 Union Prayer Book, I, morocco.....	1.40	145.60
118 Union Prayer Book, I, extra morocco.....	1.75	206.50
626 Union Prayer Book, II, cloth.....	.70	438.20
561 Union Prayer Book, II, leather.....	1.05	589.05
98 Union Prayer Book, II, morocco.....	1.40	137.20
191 Union Prayer Book, II, extra mor.....	1.75	334.25
223 Sabbath Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	39.02
627 Week Day Service.....	.17½	109.73
525 Union Hymnal30	157.50
560 Union Haggadah, cloth.....	.17½	98.00
363 Union Haggadah, cloth gilt35	127.05
196 Union Haggadah, limp leather.....	.70	137.20

1,281 Year Book, paper	\$.35	\$448.35
303 Year Book, cloth70	212.10
797 Sermons, paper25	199.25
23 Sermons, cloth.....	.85	19.55
Total		<hr/> \$3825.20

EXHIBIT C.

SALES FROM JUNE 1, 1909-SEPT. 30, 1909.

948 Union Prayer Book, I, cloth.....	\$.70	\$663.60
195 Union Prayer Book, I, leather.....	1.05	204.75
34 Union Prayer Book, I, morocco.....	1.40	47.60
78 Union Prayer Book, I, extra morocco.....	1.75	136.50
1,657 Union Prayer Book, II, cloth.....	.70	1159.90
269 Union Prayer Book, II, leather.....	1.05	282.45
26 Union Prayer Book, II, morocco.....	1.40	36.40
63 Union Prayer Book, II, extra morocco.....	1.75	110.25
551 Sabbath Evening and Morning Service.....	.17½	96.43
10 Week Day Service.....	.17½	1.75
461 Union Hymnal30	138.30
12 Year Book, paper.....	.35	4.20
2 Year Book, cloth70	1.40
Total		<hr/> \$2883.53

EXHIBIT D.

MONTHLY SALES.

1909—June	\$ 211.82
July	71.23
August	703.25
September.....	1891.62
September (Year Books).....	5.61
Total	<hr/> \$2883.53
Balance due from June 1, 1909.....	591.18
Grand Total	<hr/> \$3469.10

REMITTANCES.

August 28, 1909.....	\$200.00
September 18, 1909	400.00
September 27, 1909	200.00
October 20, 1909.....	400.00
<hr/>	
Total	\$1200.00
Charged to Conference (see Exhibit F).....	\$ 339.40
<hr/>	
	\$1539.40

EXHIBIT E.

SUMMARY.

Balance due Conference June 1, 1909.....	\$ 591.18
Value of Books received, etc. (see Exhibit A).....	6878.53
<hr/>	
	\$7469.71

Stock on Hand (Exhibit B).....	\$3825.20
Cash Remittances (Exhibit D).....	1200.00
Charged to Conference (Exhibit F).....	339.40
<hr/>	
Total	\$5364.60

Balance due	\$2105.11
-------------------	-----------

Above balance represents the sales for part of August and entire month of September.

EXHIBIT F.

BOOKS, ETC., CHARGED TO THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS.

The following items consist of books sent out on orders from the Conference. Everything is charged to the Conference at actual cost.

1909.

June 10 Rebate on 44 U. P. Bk. sets at 30c., (Jewish Orphan Asylum)	\$ 13.20
June 10 Charged back to Conference: 413 Margolis Reprints and 18 Synod at 35c.....	150.85
June 11 Postage and expressage on Tracts (Order of Dr. Morgenstern)	1.27

June 21	Postage on Tracts, \$1.13; 1 Year Book, cloth, to Dr. Wise at 70c.; expressage on Tract II. from Cincinnati, \$5.90	\$ 7.73
July 21	Rebate on 70 U. P. Bk. I, cloth, at 10c., \$7.00; (Jew. O. A., Cleveland); 24 Sabbath Evening and Morning Service, \$4.20 and expressage 60c. to David Neumark, Frankfort, Mich	11.80
Aug. 23	To Rabbi S. Friedberg, Liverpool: 13 Year Books (1 cloth) \$4.90; expressage 90c.; to Jewish Orphans' Home, Los Angeles: 20 Sab. Evening and Morning Service, \$3.50; expressage 50c.....	9.80
Sept. 10	To Rev. J. Marcus, Hebrew Institute, Chicago: 100 sets U. P. Bk. cloth, \$1.40; expressage, \$4.75.....	144.75
Total		<hr/> \$339.40

EXHIBIT G.

NEW CONGREGATIONS.

The Union Prayer Book has been introduced in the following congregations since June 1, 1909:

Temple Israel, Far Rockaway, N. Y.

New Bern, N. C.

Sinai Congregation, New York.

Muskogee, Okl.

Richmond, Va. (Part I.)

The report of the Finance Committee was read by its Chairman, Rabbi Julian Morgenstern, and on motion, was referred to the Auditing Committee.

REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE.

To the President and Members, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN: Your Committee on Finance, appointed in accordance with the amendment to the By-Laws of our Constitution, adopted at the 1908 Convention, to consider all recommendations of appropriation of money, and to present to the Conference at its annual meeting a statement of its financial condition, begs leave to submit the following report:

In accordance with instructions, your Committee, after a careful study of the financial status and outlook of the Conference at that time, presented to the Executive Committee, at its regular October meeting, a budget for the year 1908-1909. Confronted with the fact that in 1907-

1908 the expenditures from the General Fund had exceeded the income by \$703.65, it was clear that all Conference affairs must be administered as economically as possible. In consequence of the adoption of the budget, prepared along these lines, and the conscientious endeavor of your executive officers and committee chairmen to conform to the allowances of the budget, the excess of expenditures from the General Fund over income for the year 1908-1909 was only \$266.34. However, two facts must be taken into consideration here: (1) had not \$210.50 been received as donations to the Tract Fund, in response to an appeal for co-operation addressed to congregations and individuals, the deficit in the General Fund would have been correspondingly larger; (2) as the result of the necessity of maintaining the most extreme economy, and, if at all possible, keeping within the limits of the income of the General Fund, the sums that could be appropriated for the various committees were, in several cases, particularly in that of Committee on the Lyceum Bureau, inadequate for the committee to carry out its plans in full and to realize the complete possibilities of its usefulness. This is, of course, a serious condition, that should be carefully kept in mind in the consideration of all new Conference undertakings involving any considerable expense.

For the current year, 1909-1910, the financial outlook, under present conditions is not at all reassuring, as the subjoined table will show:

Income (estimated)—

From publications	\$ 1,550.00
“ dues	450.00
“ interest	40.00
	<hr/>
Total	\$ 2,040.00

Expenditures (fixed)—

Already expended	\$ 161.45
Balance on allowance for Corresponding Sec'y	200.00
Subventions already established	25.00
Treasurer's bond	20.00
For reporting Conference	185.00

Expenditures (estimated)—

Year-Book (including postage)	775.00
Incidental expenses	200.00
	<hr/>

Total	\$ 1,566.45
-----------------	-------------

Balance	\$ 473.55
-------------------	-----------

From this balance of \$473.55 the expenses of all committees, of the meeting of the Executive Committee, of all subventions, if such be authorized and approved, and of all other Conference activities, must be met. While on the one hand it is very probable that quite a number of contributions to our Tract Fund will be received, if this matter be properly pushed, on the other hand, if the Conference order that the necessary corrections in the plates of the Union Prayer-Book be made this year, the income from publications will be decreased by half of the cost of these corrections. In view of the facts that the Conference expended last year for committee appropriations, Executive Committee meeting and subventions, \$622.41, that the efficiency of many committees was diminished by the small appropriations allowed them, and that this year the Committee on the Geiger Centenary, and other committees, will surely need sums considerably larger than those allowed them last year, it is clear that the amount at the disposal of the Conference for these purposes, under present conditions, is altogether inadequate, and that accordingly the Conference is confronted with the prospect of a deficit in the General Fund for the current year greatly in excess of that of last year.

Furthermore, looking into the future somewhat, in 1910-1911 it will be necessary to print another edition of the Union Prayer-Book. This, of course, involves a considerable expense, and the income from publications will naturally be correspondingly diminished. Accordingly, the income to the General Fund for the year 1910-1911 will almost certainly be less than that of the current year, while there is no reason to believe that the expenditures can be decreased. There is consequently the prospect of a deficit in the General Fund for 1910-1911 larger even than for the current year.

During the six years from 1903 to 1909 the annual income of the General Fund has been approximately the same, averaging \$2,045.18. During the same period the expenditures from the General Fund have increased steadily, due, of course, to the rapid expansion of the activities of the Conference, until for the past two years they have averaged \$2,397.74. It is to be expected that the activities of the Conference will continue to expand, and accordingly the expenditures from the General Fund at the same time. It is to be equally expected that the sales of the Union Prayer-Book, the chief source of income of the Conference, will fall off noticeably, now that the large congregations of the country, with few exceptions, have introduced the book, and the average annual income to the General Fund will decrease from year to year. The Conference is therefore confronted with the prospect of a large and steadily increasing excess of expenditure from the General Fund over income. On July 1, 1907, the balance on hand in the General Fund was \$4,608.98. In the two years since the excess of expenditures over income was \$969.99. The balance on hand, therefore, on July 1, 1909, was \$3,638.99. It is evident that, at

the present rate of decrease, under present conditions, and with the present financial outlook, it is a matter of only a few years until the General Fund will be totally exhausted. It is readily apparent that steps must be taken immediately to prevent this by materially and permanently increasing the income to the General Fund.

In this connection the Committee desires to call the attention of the Conference to the fact that at the 1907 Conference the recommendation of the Auditing Committee, that the interest on the investments of the Relief Fund accrue to that fund alone, was adopted by the Conference (Year-Book XVII, 148f). Previous to that time the interest on all investments had been divided equally between the General and Relief Funds. The committee's recommendation was based, no doubt, upon the fact that in the years 1905-1906 and 1906-1907 the income to the General Fund had exceeded the expenditures by \$1,101.65, apparently a very large sum. However, in the year 1904-1905 the expenditures had exceeded the income by \$471.14. Consequently, for the three years, 1904-1907, the income to the General Fund exceeded the expenditures by only \$630.51. Had the present system of distributing the interest on Conference investments been in force in those years, instead of the above excess of income over expenditures the reverse condition would have prevailed, and the expenditures would have exceeded the income by about \$320.00. From this it is clear that the recommendation of the Auditing Committee of that year was ill-advised, and the action of the Conference, adopting the recommendation, hasty. Furthermore, had the old method of distributing the interest been in force during the past year, instead of the expenditures exceeding the income by \$266.34 there would have been a balance of about \$135.00 on the right side of the ledger, or, as is more probable, the various committees, with this much more at their disposal, would have been able to discharge their duties far more effectively than was possible with the actual, insufficient appropriations.

In view of these facts your Committee recommends:

I. That the Conference return to the method in force previous to 1907-1908, of dividing the interest received from the investment of all Conference moneys equally between the Relief and General Funds.

II. That a vigorous campaign be conducted to secure donations to the Tract Fund, particularly in the form of annual subscriptions, in order that this most worthy undertaking may be carried on on the large scale necessary to attain the best and most widespread results, and the General Fund at the same time relieved of the comparatively large outlay necessary to carry on the work even on its present small scale.

Should these recommendations be adopted by the Conference, the present financial condition will be relieved, and for the next few years, at least, the income to the General Fund should equal the expenditures. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that, as the Conference activities con-

tinue to expand, as they undoubtedly will, and the expenditures from the General Fund be increased accordingly, the time will come, and that soon, when the income to the General Fund, even with the adoption of the previous recommendations, will no longer suffice. While your Committee feels that the time is not yet ripe for definite recommendation of ways and means by which the income to the General Fund might be increased sufficiently to meet approaching conditions, nevertheless it urges that the Conference take due cognizance of the gravity of these conditions, and that the new Finance Committee be instructed to consider this problem and present at the next Conference suggestions for its solution.

Respectfully submitted,

JULIAN MORGENSTERN,
MOSES J. GRIES,
DAVID MARX.

The President appointed the following committees:

Press: Rabbis Landman, Bergman, Frisch, Lefkowitz, E. Mayer.

Resolutions: Rabbis Enelow, Currick, Fox, Friedman, Goldenson, Guttman, Isaacs, C. S. Levi, Marx, Rosenau, Silverman.

Auditing Committee: Rabbis Harris, Aaron, Freund, Lyons, Rypins.

Committee on President's Message: Rabbis Berkowitz, H. Cohen, Friedlander, Kohler, Krauskopf, Martin Meyer, Schlesinger, Schulman, Stolz, Wolsey.

Committee on Resolutions for Departed Members: Newfield, Brill, Ehrenreich, Hausmann, Kahn, Kornfeld, G. Solomon.

The Chair—The first impulse to our meeting in New York at this time was given by the fact that the centenary of the birth of Dr. Einhorn falls today. The Executive Committee, with this thought in mind, felt that the meeting of the Conference should be postponed from our regular time to this date. It was also felt we should meet in this metropolis, at a season of the year, when all the communal activities are in full swing. For these two reasons we are here today. I take it as a splendid sign of the union which has come among the reformers of our faith, that the differences of fifty years ago are healed. The symbol of this, we have in the living presence of the man who is both the successor of Dr. Wise as the President of the Hebrew

Union College and the son-in-law of Dr. Einhorn. Considering therefore, that he combines in himself these two distinctions, and the further distinction that he can stand for himself as a scholar and as a man, it is extremely proper that the academic paper on the life and work of David Einhorn should be read by him, the close relative of the man whose memory we are celebrating today, the successor of the founder of the College, and one of the great scholars in the Jewish world at present—Dr. Kaufman Kohler.

Dr. Kohler then read his paper on David Einhorn, in honor of the one-hundredth anniversary of his birth. (cf. Appendix *b*.)

At the conclusion of the paper, on motion, a rising vote of thanks was extended to the author.

In addition to Rabbi Landsberg (cf. Appendix *b*, close), the discussion was participated in by Rabbis Silverman, Schulman and Friedlander.

After some slight readjustment of the program for the following day, the Conference adjourned.

WEDNESDAY EVENING.

Memorial services in honor of the one hundredth anniversary of David Einhorn were held in Temple Beth-El at eight o'clock. The opening prayer was delivered by Rabbi Max C. Currick. A selection from Scriptures was read by Rabbi David Alexander. After introductory remarks by the President, the memorial address was delivered by Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch, after which the closing prayer was pronounced by Rabbi Rudolph Grossman.

THURSDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 11, 1909.

The Conference was opened with prayer by Rabbi Abram Brill.

The minutes of the preceding session were read and approved.

The report of the Committee on Scripture readings was presented by its Chairman, Rabbi Maurice H. Harris.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCRIPTURE READINGS.

In 1904, at the Louisville Conference, I presented a project for an arrangement of the weekly Pentateuchal readings different from that found in the present Union Prayer-Book, insofar as it proposed to conform each Sidrah to the portion read in the synagogues throughout the world. It considered in detail how to treat those scriptural sections less suited to public reading. The plan was discussed and received endorsement.

At a later Conference I was asked to specify accurately, with chapter and verse, just what Scripture portion could be assigned for each current week, and to have this outline printed and circulated among the members, so that they could all give it their thorough scrutiny. This was accordingly done.

At the first Conference at Frankfort, Michigan, where this report was read, I was requested not only to select portions from the Pentateuch, but the Haftarothe likewise—to have both printed in full and circulated among the members. To fully undertake this work a committee was appointed, consisting of Rabbis Martin A. Meyer, Isaac S. Moses, and myself, as Chairman. This work was likewise done.

At the last Conference—also at Frankfort—being absent in Europe, Dr. Meyer reported for the Committee. The Conference concluded that it needed more time to peruse these readings, and that, inasmuch as in its present form it was too bulky, it should be referred back to the Committee that was further enlarged by the addition of Rabbis Rudolph Grossman, Alexander Lyons and Samuel Goldenson.

Your Committee has therefore been at work revising its own product. It has found that it has been able to shorten the readings, both of Sidroth and Haftarothe, and that this excision has really strengthened the work by removing redundancies and by the discriminating compression that brought out the very best of the Scripture lesson. The Committee has labored hard and conscientiously, and has carefully corrected all typographical and other errors that crept into its first draft. It has corrected the manuscript, and its final redaction is now in your hands. Gentlemen of the Conference, what is your pleasure?

The Committee earnestly urge the Conference that it be permitted to complete this work, to have it printed in its final form, uniform with the Union Prayer-Book, to be used first separately, and ultimately to be incorporated with it.

MAURICE H. HARRIS,
Chairman.

Rabbi Stolz—The proper thing would be to refer this matter to the incoming Executive Committee; they should refer it in turn to the Publication Committee for report at another meeting

of the Conference. There are many things to be considered, the bulk of the book and price, and so on. I would move you, that this report be referred to the incoming Executive Committee, they in turn to refer it to the Publication Committee.

Rabbi Enelow—I would amend, that the Executive Committee be given power to act.

Rabbi Harris—Could we not have it printed in page form and in the type which will be ultimately used, so that if it is finally accepted, there will be no additional expense? Would you empower your committee to have it printed in that form?

Rabbi Guttmacher—I am heartily in favor of having the report referred to the Executive Committee with power to act. I believe these selections ought to be submitted to every member of this Conference. In order to save expense, it is only necessary to indicate the place.

Rabbi Harris—We have here and there omitted a verse, or portion of a verse, where there was redundancy.

Rabbi Martin Meyer—My recollection is, that after that manuscript was sent out last year, not a single reply was received by our committee. We have followed that manuscript to all intents and purposes. Here and there we have made some slight changes. So really, the members of Conference have the manuscript as it will finally appear in print, save a great many redactions that have been made by Rabbi Harris.

Rabbi Morgenstern—It was felt at the time, that the whole matter might be rendered unnecessary by the new translation of the Bible.

The Chair—I suggest that we suspend this discussion and hear Dr. Deutsch read his report on contemporaneous history, as he must attend the Asher funeral.

Dr. Deutsch thereupon read the report of the Committee on Contemporaneous History.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTEMPORANEOUS HISTORY.

The undersigned Chairman of your Committee begs to submit the following resolutions and suggestions for your consideration:

Jewish literature has lost in the death of Meier Friedman, who de-

parted this life at Vienna, November 28, 1908, one of its most learned and brilliant devotees. By his indefatigable labors to present the text of Midrashic works correctly in form, and by his elucidating notes, which are based on rare acumen and on wide reading, hardly equaled by any living authority, Meier Friedman has earned the lasting gratitude of the students of Jewish literature, and particularly of the Rabbis, to whom the Midrash is the most helpful and needed of all productions of the Jewish past.

Be it therefore *Resolved*, That this Conference records its grief at the demise of the great scholar and conveys its sympathy to the members of his family, and to the Faculty of the Israelitisch-Theologische Lehranstalt of Vienna.

At an age which is far above the time usually allotted to man, Rev. Prof. David Woolf Marks, for many years minister of the West London congregation of British Jews, went to his eternal rest May 3, 1909, in his ninety-eighth year. David Woolf Marks stood at the cradle of the Reform movement in England. Since 1841 he was the central figure of the liberal interpretation of Judaism in the British environment, which generally tends toward a conservative view of religion, and while for years retired, he never ceased to take interest in the affairs of our faith. We who believe with him, that the future of Judaism can only be assured, by an unreserved admission that a difference must be made in religion, between the eternal and divine on one hand and the human and passing on the other, will forever look up to this departed teacher in Israel with admiration and gratitude.

Be it therefore *Resolved*. That this Conference record its sentiment of admiration for the departed sage, and its gratitude for the lasting value of a life rich in labor and success, and that the sympathies of this body be conveyed to the members of the family of the sainted teacher in Israel.

The nineteenth century has created a new agency for the conveyance of Jewish thought by the periodical press. Amongst the various agencies which promote the objects of our religious institutions, the press, owing to the large number of people whom it reaches either directly or indirectly, either at once or in later years, occupies the foremost rank. While there were timid beginnings in this direction, towards the end of the eighteenth century, the real influence of the Jewish press does not begin until the appearance of the "*Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*," in 1837. This oldest of all existing Jewish press organs has lost its brilliant editor, Dr. Gustav Karpeles, who died at Nauheim, July 21, 1909. Gustav Karpeles was, beyond any doubt, one of the leading publicists of our faith.

Combining a facile pen and brilliant humor with sound knowledge of Jewish life and Jewish literature, his death means a severe loss to our cause, and this loss is particularly mourned by the representatives of American Judaism, who saw in him a sympathetic friend and a sincere advocate of the liberal interpretation of our faith, which he often personally and in writing expressed by his admiration of American Judaism and its institutions.

Be it therefore *Resolved*. That this Conference express its sincere grief at the untimely death of this brilliant author and noble Israelite, and that these sentiments be conveyed to the publisher of the "*Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*," to the Union of German-Jewish literary societies, and to the widow of the deceased.

Moses Bloch, for thirty years professor of Talmudic literature at the Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest, came to his grave August 6, 1909, at the high old age of ninety-four. "Like as a shock of corn cometh in its season." Bred in an environment of the strictest orthodoxy, as the grandson of Eleazar Loew, one of the bitterest opponents of the Hamburg temple, Moses Bloch for many years, as a Rabbi, was an exponent of strictly conservative views. This, however, did not prevent him from accepting the chair of Talmud when, in 1877, the Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest opened its doors under the thunders of excommunication by the fanatical wing of Hungarian Judaism. Moses Bloch believed in scientific treatment of rabbinical literature, and as a prominent member of the faculty of his institution he scattered the seed of a sound and modern conception of Judaism amongst his disciples, who now in many congregations in Hungary and other countries occupy prominent positions. To him as a scholar, and as a contributor of works of lasting worth to Jewish literature, the admiration of this body is due.

Be it therefore *Resolved*. That this Conference express its grief at the demise of this aged scholar, and convey these sentiments to the Rabbinical Seminary of Budapest and to the family of the deceased.

Russian Judaism has lost one of its most venerated leaders in the death of Baron Horace de Guenzburg, who departed this life at St. Petersburg March 1, 1909. Baron de Guenzburg belonged to a family whose members for three generations have upheld the ancient tradition in Israel, so rare in our days, of combining wealth and zeal for communal interests with Jewish learning. In his early manhood the hope of Russian Judaism was for intellectual progress as the means of the improvement of the sad condition in this branch of the household of Israel. Unfortunate events,

for now almost thirty years, have proven that the condition in the empire of the Czar presents an aspect entirely different from that of western Europe. The rapid progress in secular education, the earnest and successful efforts in propagating agriculture and mental trades amongst the Jews, have obtained the success that was justly anticipated. Nevertheless Baron de Guenzburg as one who, through a public career of half a century, worked for the elevation of the masses of our Russian coreligionists in the sense in which western Europe, since the time of Moses Mendelssohn, has successfully worked for the improvement of Jewish conditions, deserves to be remembered as a blessing in Israel.

Be it therefore *Resolved*, That this Conference record its grief at the death of the noble philanthropist and zealous Israelite, and convey its sentiment to Baron David de Guenzburg, the son of the deceased, and to the Society for the Promotion of Culture amongst the Russian Jews.

Since this body last assembled three prominent non-Jews, whose life work deserves recognition on our part, have been removed from this earth. They are Joseph Leicester Lyne (Father Ignatius), in London October 13, 1908; Theodore Haase, Protestant minister of Teschen, Austria, March 27, 1909, and Theodore Barth, member of the German Reichstag, June 3, 1909. Father Ignatius, in spite of what may appear to us as eccentricities, has, by his genuine warm love for Israel, which he expressed in so many eloquent addresses, and in his whole life, deserved a grateful and lasting remembrance. Theodore Haase has, in days when the hatred of the Jewish people received a new impetus from members of his profession, vigorously, in Parliament and in the press, denounced the un-Christian character of a mediaeval brutality disguised under a modern scientific name. So has Theodore Barth, the prominent politician and publicist, worked by his pen, and in his capacity as president of the society for the combating of anti-semitism, upheld the idea of true liberalism, now so often ridiculed as an invertebrate and colorless humanitarianism. Of all these men we say, "May the Lord recompense their work, and may a full reward be given to them by the Lord, the God of Israel."

The death of Jacob Gordin, the most popular of all Yiddish playwrights, is in many ways suggestive to a body of men to whom the future of Judaism is a matter of serious concern. The Yiddish drama is hardly thirty years old, and it is through the conditions as they developed in America since 1881 that it attained its present importance. Even Yiddish literature, if we do not include books of religious edification for the

women and unlearned, and clumsy attempts at adaptation from foreign literatures, is very young. Both exercise an influence which seems unequaled by any previous branch of literary work in Judaism, for it reaches the masses which formerly were not reached at all by literary efforts, or at best only by such adaptations from a rabbinical literature as the **מנורת המאור** **צאינה וראינה**. It cannot be without significance that Jacob Gordin would not have any religious ceremony take place at his funeral. It is certainly significant that in his plays the conforming and observant Jew is usually the bad man. Such a tendency in literature requires serious thought for counteraction in the large circles which it reaches, and from which within thirty years the rank and file of our congregations, social and charitable institutions will be composed. It is impossible for the undersigned to make definite suggestions as to the nature of the work required in this direction, but it would seem to be a worthy recommendation for an action by the incoming Executive Committee, who might devise plans for a propaganda for religious thought amongst the Yiddish-speaking un-orthodox population.

The change of Turkey from an autocracy to a modern constitutional form of government has brought to our attention anew the work to be done amongst the Jews of the Orient, and particularly in Palestine. The numerous Jews in the last-named country, which now may number 20,000 or more, require and obtain the attention of their co-religionists in Europe and America. Unfortunately a great deal of this attention is obtained by begging circulars. It would be very easy to disregard such appeals by an unreserved condemnation of "Schnorring." Palestine is the land of our fathers, and no matter how one stands with regard to the nationalistic principle, it is not to the credit of Judaism that the archæological research in that country is done by non-Jews, chiefly by Christian theologians, and not rarely with funds furnished by Jewish patrons on the suggestion of prominent non-Jews. Aside from this sentimental aspect the sociological question requires serious attention. There are 80,000 Jews in Palestine, and their number is bound to increase, whether we rejoice at it or deplore it, by immigration from eastern Europe, where religious enthusiasm inspires emigration, and from Persia, Morocco and Arabia, where mysticism is the consolation in times of unbearable misery. For these masses of destitute people institutions of charity are a necessity; for the youth, institutions of learning have to be provided; for the younger element particularly, means of improving their economic condition must be devised. Palestine is now already the land of institutions. There are hospitals, homes for the aged, orphan asylums, schools of all kinds, and societies for the improvement of the economic status of the population. All these in-

stitutions send out their circulars asking for support. It often happens that people will help an undeserving cause. Very often individuals who have no particular claim on recognition send out their circulars in questionable English, and undoubtedly the business must pay in the end. Often charitably-inclined people wish to be advised as to the nature of the appeals sent to them. It would seem a highly commendable aim for this Conference to create a board of inquiry, listing the institutions according to their worth and their claim on recognition, and not only to answer inquiries made, but to publish also the results of this investigation from time to time in the public press.

Literary work in Judaism is still the Cinderella of our public activities, and it is merely due to the sacrificing idealism of Jewish scholars that our literature makes a good showing in the annual reports. The only remedy is that of subventions of organizations. Amongst the works which seem to the undersigned to deserve particular attention are the Dictionary of Ben Jehudah, of which the first volume has already appeared; the edition of the Jerusalem Talmud, undertaken by A. M. Luncz; the Hebrew Encyclopedia, edited by J. D. Eisenstein, of which already three volumes have been published; the Bible, with a critical commentary in Hebrew by Abraham Kahana, and finally, the revival of the society Mekize Nirdamim, which has for its object the editing of unpublished works of the older literature. Some of these undertakings have been subsidized by this Conference in the past, and I recommend the continuation of this subsidy in some cases, and the granting of a new subsidy to those thus far not recognized, either from the means at our disposal or by appeals to liberal-minded Jews of this country.

A very gratifying phenomenon in the Jewish life of the last year is a most remarkable progress of the liberal thought in Judaism. In Germany, the home of the movement, after a lull of thirty odd years, a very gratifying activity is being displayed. In London the Jewish Religious Union is making great strides towards furthering its aims. In Australia, which so long was under the influence of English conservatism, a revision of the ritual is being vigorously advocated. Even in Russia, where under the present conditions internal affairs of Judaism will naturally not appeal to large circles, the rise of the Reform movement has been announced. The undersigned would recommend that the incoming Executive Committee communicate with the Society for Liberal Judaism in Germany, with Mr. Claude G. Montefiore in London, with Mr. Isaac Jacobs in Melbourne, Australia, and with Mr. N. Pereferkovitch in St. Petersburg, expressing to these

men and organizations our gratification at the triumphal onward march of the liberal interpretation of Judaism, and offering them to furnish the literature published by this Conference, particularly our Year-Books and rituals, and also inviting by circular all members of this Conference to furnish such addresses and works which will help to strengthen religious liberalism in the required number of copies to the Executive Committee, which will distribute them to those addressed, where they will be helpful.

Respectfully submitted,

G. DEUTSCH,

Chairman Committee on Contemporaneous History.

The resolution of condolence at the end of each paragraph was adopted by a rising vote of the Conference. At the close of the paragraph referring to Dr. Gustav Karpeles Dr. Kohler spoke as follows:

Rabbi Kohler—Mr. President, while I endorse every word of the Chairman's proposition, it seems to me, that he does not give sufficient credit to Dr. Karpeles for what he did toward the promotion of Jewish literature and Jewish history. He did a great deal more than work for the Jewish press and Jewish journalism, as editor of the "Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums." Throughout Germany and Austria he has brought about renewed interest in Jewish affairs, and in Jewish literature. He wrote a history of Jewish literature which, though somewhat faulty, because he was not clear as to the beginnings of Jewish literature, yet is a work for which scholars will ever be thankful. He made Jewish literature interesting as well as instructive, to laymen as well as to students. He has by his devotion to Judaism, by his recognition of its progressive spirit, done a great deal for the promotion of Jewish life and Jewish thought. Furthermore, he wrote as a Jew. And during the last twenty years when Heine has by the anti-Semitic spirit been prescribed even in death, hounded as he was hounded in life in both high and low places, he has brought Heine to the foreground and forced the German public to recognize what Heine did. In a word, he has done great work that should be better recognized, than was done here by the otherwise laudable report of the Chairman.

The Chair—It is now moved that we adopt the resolution (at the end of the paragraph on Prof. Karpeles) by a rising vote. It is further moved, that this resolution be referred to the incoming Executive Committee who in conjunction with Dr. Deutsch, will enlarge it in view of the remarks of Dr. Kohler. Carried.

Rabbi Stolz—I think it will come with much more force before the public, if the Resolutions Committee condense these various paragraphs into one and we then adopt it. I move this be referred to the Resolutions Committee.

The motion was seconded and carried.

On motion, duly seconded and carried, the report as a whole was then received.

The Chair—We will now take up the report of the Committee on Scriptural Readings.

Rabbi Stolz—The motion before the house is, to give the whole matter to the Executive Committee with power to act. The Executive Committee can meet only once at the utmost, before our next meeting. They will not have much time to consider the matter while in session. Let us not make any mistake. I hope the amendment will not carry, but that the original motion will carry, that it be referred to the Executive Committee and that a report be presented to the next meeting.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I think the Conference should defer action on this matter, in view of the fact that a new translation of the Bible is being made. We are in the same position as last year. If it be not necessary for us to publish this work, then it is a great gain for us. Furthermore, the argument was advanced, that it certainly would be an admirable thing, if the Conference could bring the Jewish public to use the Bible itself, instead of the extracts in the prayer book. Consequently there is no need to hurry. We have published a number of editions of the prayer book as it is. I amend, that the matter be referred back to the committee, to be brought up at the next Conference.

Rabbi Foster—The gentleman says the idea is to have our people read the Bible instead of the portions in the prayer book.

But that is the ultimate purpose of the synagogues themselves. The people becoming familiar with the best portions of the Pentateuch, will in time, read the Bible.

Rabbi Levi—I consider it somewhat discourteous to the committee, to take out of its hands a matter of this kind. I think the Conference will not be delayed by referring this report on this matter, back to the same committee. Next year we can have the matter up when the new translation of the Bible is out.

Rabbi Harris—The publication of the new translation of the Bible does not change our relation to these particular Scripture readings. There have always been good translations of the Bible, still we never thought it necessary to abolish these readings in the prayer book. There is a distinct and valuable service to be rendered by the printing of these selected portions that bring out the beauty and the essence of the Scriptures.

The Chair—The amendment to the motion is, that the matter be referred back to the Committee to report again at the next Conference.

Rabbi Harris—We would like instructions as to what form you would like it presented in, as differing from the form presented this morning.

The Chair—All those in favor of the amendment of Dr. Morgenstern, that the committee bring its report to the next Conference, as it did to this Conference, will so indicate.

The amendment was lost.

The Chair—The motion now is, that the matter be referred to the Executive Committee, with instructions to report to the next Conference.

The motion carried.

The Chair—According to your resolution of yesterday, we will now resolve ourselves into a congregation, to listen to the prayer and the special address for the departed, Joseph Mayor Asher. I call on Rabbi Rothstein to offer prayer.

Rabbi Rothstein offered prayer.

The Chair—At my request, Dr. Maurice H. Harris has consented to deliver a brief address upon his late colleague.

RABBI HARRIS: Simultaneously with this solemn memorial service, a parallel service is being conducted for our departed colleague, Joseph Mayor Asher, in the Synagogue Orach Chayim, that was the field of his labors—removed from us a little distance in space, removed from us a little further in religious interpretation, but very near to us just now in spirit, for “One touch of nature makes the whole world kin.” The Synagogue Orach Chayim is for the moment changed to Beth Chayim, the euphemistic term for the house of death.

In the midst of life we are in death. In the midst of our religious activity here for the living faith, the death summons intrudes. So sure are we of the fact of death, so unaware of the hour of its summons. Annually we call our muster roll, and each year there are a few who do not answer. We can never tell מי יחיה ומי ימות Our Conference programs vary each year, but a memorial address for the year's departed is an unfailing item. “One generation cometh, one generation goeth.” The institutions live, but the separate persons die. “The individual withers, but the world is more and more.”

How little we know the outcome of events. We had expected at this very place, at this very hour, to speak of marriage; Providence has decided we should speak of death.

Yes, death is an unbroken story, from David Einhorn right down to Joseph Mayor Asher, who will be bedded to rest this day.

But Rabbi Asher was not a member of this Rabbinic Conference. I do not think he was in sympathy with its aims. On his visit to his mother country, England, whose citizenship he never renounced, he did not speak approvingly of American Reform. On the Friday night on which he spoke to my congregation, Temple Israel, he did so with misgiving. No, our theological thoughts were not his thoughts, nor our religious ways his ways. Why then have we ceased our session here to pay a tribute to him? Because, in spite of our diversities, he was one with us in many of the essentials of Judaism. There are certain grand hopes which the whole house of Israel in common shares. In life we may dwell on our differences, in death we emphasize our unities.

We remember here and now that he was a Rabbi in Israel, and we Rabbis here do mourn him now.

Yet there is another and a profounder reason why we would make the *hesped* of Joseph Asher part of our proceedings. Not merely for the reason that he was a scholar, though a profound scholar he was in classic learning and in Talmudic lore, sitting at the feet of philosophers in Cambridge, and of Chachamim in the Yeshiboth of Poland; and in turn scholars sat at his feet at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Nay, our chief tribute at this solemn hour is not so much to the Rabbi or the scholar as it is to the man. At our best we would be teachers and uplifters. It matters little what a man's convictions are; it matters

everything that he lives consistent with them. Joseph Mayor Asher had the courage of his convictions. Therefore was he worthy to be the teacher of us all.

A few years ago we saw him at the head of a congregation of prominence in this metropolis. Its membership was such as would be socially congenial to this gentleman and scholar. Its material outlook was prosperous. It assured him an ample maintenance. Why not ensconce himself comfortably in that snug and secure harbor? Was not all well?

Not quite. Its ritual was conservative, yet not such as was in accord with his conscientious scruples, though it was what we would almost call an orthodox congregation, maintaining many oriental associations that we have abandoned, but not conservative enough for him, who brooked not an iota of compromise with the traditions of his ancestors.

So he left that comfortable post because he could no longer hold it with honor. He went forth among an humbler group, and established, together with them, the Synagogue Orach Chayim, where he could walk the "way of life" in the strictest accord with the ancient ritual of Israel. Here he was at peace, because there was peace in his soul; here he taught and labored until the divine summons came.

So we reverently pay our tribute of esteem to the colleague who differed from us so widely, because he was a man "who dared do all that becomes a man." Let us call him great because he was honest. "Know ye not that a prince and a great man hath fallen this day in Israel?"

Living little more than half of the traditional "three score and ten," say not it was a fragment of a life, if we would measure it by quality. Call it a full life, an inspiring life. Let us take from it inspiration as we go marching on.

Rabbi Stolz—Not only has this been a very beautiful, sincere and exemplary tribute to our brother, but it has also been a wonderful mark of good-will and toleration on the part of our Conference toward others. I move that this eulogy be embodied as a whole in our Year Book, and also that there be three minutes of silent devotion, before we resume our business.

Rabbi Schlesinger—I amend, a resolution of condolence, to be prepared by the Committee on Memorial Resolutions, be sent to the family.

The motion as amended, was carried.

The Conference sat in silent communion for three minutes, after which the business of the morning was resumed.

The report of the Committee on Revision of the Union Hymnal, was read by its Chairman, Rabbi David Marx.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE UNION HYMNAL.

To the President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

BRETHREN: Your Committee on the Revision of the Union Hymnal begs leave to report as follows:

At a midwinter meeting of the Conference, held in this city eighteen years ago, the project of publishing a "Union Hymnal" was debated, and a committee appointed to give this subject special consideration. The difficulties which confronted this committee, as well as subsequent ones, until the Hymnal appeared on the 24th day of September, 1897, are set forth in the several reports made to the Conference during the intervening years. The task was by no means easy. Material was scarce, and, though the workmen were willing and anxious, long delays in correspondence added extra weight to the other burdens. Though the function of these committees was to gather and edit the texts of the hymns to be incorporated, while the Society of American Cantors was to provide the musical settings, the brief space of five years was all too short for doing justice to the magnitude of the undertaking. Popular interest in the completion of the work compelled haste, and thereby did serious injury to such pre-publication revision, as would have resulted from leisure and less imperative demands. The Hymnal could not escape imperfection. Yet, despite its shortcomings, within nine months after its appearance 4,453 copies were sold, and a second edition of 5,000 was disposed of with proportionate rapidity. (Year-Book '98, p. 35.) The introduction of the book into many congregations gave opportunity for appreciation of its value, the timeliness of its creation, no less so than for a close analysis of its contents. The feeling that some changes should be made in the book was soon voiced, for at the Philadelphia Conference, in 1901 (Year-Book, p. 51), the now lamented Alois Kaiser, Chairman of the Cantors' Association, suggested that a decade be allowed to transpire before revision be made. At the Indianapolis session of the Conference, 1906 (Year-Book, pp. 114-116), the Committee to whom had been referred the question of advisability of a revision of the Hymnal "recommended that a committee of nine be appointed to consider Jewish Hymnals in use both in Europe and America, with a view to incorporate into the Union Hymnal hymns and music appropriate for devotional use." This committee further recommended that "simplified services for the Sabbath, holidays, historic and patriotic occasions, be made part of the hymnal." The present Hymnal Committee was appointed in the fall of last year. Although a year has passed since said appointment, no final report can be made. The scope of the work is too far-reaching to have received that finality which many of you have perhaps looked for at this reading.

I regret to state that the committee has been hampered by some of its members failing *in toto* to look after their assignment. Moreover, the committee is scattered, so that all communications have been of necessity by mail. Thus questions which might easily have been settled in five minutes in conference have taken days and weeks for solution. We have therefore merely cleared the field. Our work has been constructive only insofar as the weeding-out process has given a basis upon which to build.

The liberty is taken of embodying in this report some of the subject matter which formed part of the Chairman's report to the Executive Committee at the January meeting.

Let us now consider the Hymnal.

(A)—*Analysis.*

The Hymnal consists of:

1. Hymns numbering 1 through 117 for Sabbath, festivals, etc.
2. Appendix composed of Hebrew Hymns and Responses, numbered 1 through 20.
3. Hymns for Sabbath-School, numbered 1 through 12.
4. Forty-two pages Anthem Texts and Index of Composers and Publishers.
5. Order of Hymns.
6. Index to first lines, with composers' names.

In criticism of this physical make-up of the Book, we suggest the following:

- (a) All hymns should be numbered consecutively. There should be no repetition of the number, as such repetition is confusing, and necessitates the announcement of the page, together with the number of the hymn. In the present book we have, for instance, a Hymn No. 1 on pages 3, 128 and 148.
- (b) The names of the authors of texts, as well as the names of composers of the musical setting should appear, wherever possible, with each hymn. In our present arrangement they do not so appear.
- (c) It is desirable that the metre of each hymn be given at the head of each hymn. This will provide for a greater freedom of choice in the selection of suitable music for the words.
- (d) All the words of a hymn should be on the page which contains the music of the hymn.
- (e) The table of contents should show:
 1. The general subdivision of the work.
 2. An alphabetical index of first lines.
 3. A metrical index.
 4. Hymns suitable for special occasions.

- (f) * The hymns sung in the Sabbath-School should be the hymns sung in the Temple. The present arrangement is bad, and ought to be changed. It is bad in that the children learn one set of hymns and the congregation another, with the result that what is learned in the school is of no value in the congregational service.
- (g) ** We would suggest that such material as is incorporated in our present Hymnal under the caption "Index of Composers and Publishers," be eliminated from the body of the book, and be published in pamphlet or sheet form, and that such compilation be added to from time to time as new and good music is placed on the market or old music made accessible. The expense of such publication would, we believe, be borne by the publishers, whose music would thus be advertised.

(B)—*English Texts.*

The Hymnal contains texts to the number of 129, of which 117 are in Part I and 12 in Part II (Sabbath-School hymns).

Of these 129 hymns there are duplications to the number of 6; found in Christian hymnals, 18. By this statement there is no implication that all of these latter hymns are distinctively bound up with any church. Some are so universal in character as to be the property of all.

There certainly can be no impropriety in the retention in our Hymnal of such material which is good and suitable.

Of the 117 hymns in Part I the two critics who undertook the literary and devotional review of this part of the work agreed that 34 were good, 31 were fair, 17 were indifferent, 35 were poor.

Of the 12 hymns in Part II there is no discussion here. They seem to be good for the purpose designated.

The basis of this consideration was the literary character of the hymn, its singableness, its harmony with the theology of progressive Judaism. As the authorship of none of these hymns is given, the committee found great difficulty in tracing same. In several instances, comparison of the original with the words as presented in the Hymnal showed great divergence. We have been more than half-way successful at this game of hidden authors, inasmuch as we have found sixty of them.

(C)—*Music.*

The music of the Hymnal has been carefully gone over by three skilled musicians, working independently of each other. Each one is a successful

* This paragraph was amended by the omission of the first sentence, cf. p. 82.

** This paragraph was amended, cf. p. 82.

choir or chorus master. The basis of their criticism was melody, range and sentiment.

There are in Part I musical settings numbering 121. Of these there are 9 duplications; distinctively Christian, 21; remaining, 91. Of the 91 hymns which remain 37 are good (2 duplications); 19 are fair (2 duplications); good with change, 7 (1 duplication).

The same rule which applies to authors of hymns should apply to the composers of the settings. Though in the majority of cases the composers are mentioned, there are instances in which credit is either not given at all or else erroneously given.

The full details of the investigations of text and music are at the disposal of the Conference to assist the future committee, which will have charge of the Hymnal revision. They are too lengthy, too uninteresting, or too interesting to form part of this report.

We therefore recommend, in addition to the suggestions offered above, that the Hymnal be revised according to the following plan:

(h) I. Hymns for the Sabbath, Pesach (including the Seder service hymns of the Union Haggadah); Shabuoth, Succoth, Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur, Chanukkah and Purim.

II. Hymns for the Dedication of Temples, for Decoration Day, Memorial Day, Thanksgiving Day, Corner-Stone Laying, Marriages, Funerals; also a few good processional hymns.

III. Two complete services for Sabbath evening and morning, one of these services to be in English. The music of these services to be in one key and within the range of ordinary voices.

IV. Short Sabbath-School services for various occasions. The service, together with the hymns, not to be over 10 or 15 minutes.

V. All melodies for the Sabbath to be in joyous strain, in a major rather than a minor key.

VI. All hymns to be within the range of a general audience.

A work of this magnitude will take time and money. It cannot be rushed. It need not, however, be delayed. Using as a foundation what is good and adaptable in the present Hymnal, progress can be made provided the necessary assistance be given.

We would suggest that the committee be increased to nine, so that there can be a proper division of the labor.

(i) We furthermore recommend that the contemplated revision must begin with the texts of the hymns—that each and every member of the Conference send to the committee such texts as he considers worthy of a place in the Hymnal. We are painfully aware that good hymns are very scarce, but the united efforts of this body ought certainly to be able to produce flawless gems, original or otherwise, which will enable the committee to make a selection for all the services contemplated. Having once decided upon the texts, the next step will be to secure the aid of

musicians imbued with the spirit of our services, and competent to create or to adapt from great Jewish composers, or other musical geniuses, settings which shall be sufficiently distinctive in character to insure our Hymnal first place amongst the best.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID MARX, *Chairman*,
NATHAN STERN,
ELI MAYER.

Rabbi Silverman—I was for many years a member of the old Hymnal Committee. Seldom has a report come before us, that for the practical working of our synagogue services, is of such great importance as this. We, in Emanu-El, have been using the Union Hymnal since its original publication. We have found all the objections which are mentioned in this report. I fully agree with the committee, that the work of revising the hymnal according to their plan, is a most arduous one. I move, that the recommendation of the Chairman of the Committee, that his committee be enlarged, be adopted by the Conference, and that the enlarged committee proceed with the labor of revising the hymnal, according to the suggestions made by the committee, and such other suggestions as they may receive.

The motion was duly seconded and carried.

Rabbi Levi—I move, that we take up the suggestions of the report, *seriatim*.

This motion was carried.

Recommendations *a* through *e* were adopted.

Recommendation *f* was read.

Rabbi Frisch—Our action must be based on experience. I think that statement varies from our whole psychology of today. If the children have a different unfolding in their mental life, then they must have different songs. Do you mean to say that the congregation is equally interested in "Little drops of water" and "The flag of the free?" Those are the songs the children like—those are the songs we do not like.

I amend, that there be a special part of the hymnal devoted to Sabbath School music.

Rabbi Harris—I hope this amendment will not prevail. The gentleman says he speaks out of the fullness of his experience, I speak out of mine. Congregational singing will be a success, only when the singing in the Sunday School is that of the Temple. I do advise that the music be simpler, but let us sing the same words.

Rabbi Silverman—In the old orthodox days, the same songs were sung in the home and Temple. The Christians have congregational singing, because they have the same songs in the Sunday School as in the Churches. "America" is sung by the whole country, because it is sung by the children in the public schools.

Rabbi Levi—The object of the hymnal is, to introduce congregational singing. I suppose we would all confess that we have not succeeded yet; so our efforts should be to begin again with the children. This hymnal is the children's hymnal, and finally the congregational hymnal, as they grow older. Here are forms of religious worship in song. The paragraph carries the suggestion, "When you learn this hymn in the Sabbath School, it shall be part of your service in the Temple."

Rabbi Frisch—There is no reason why the children should not find some songs in common with the congregation. I object to your making a book for the adults and trying to make the children sing it. Songs can be enjoyed and be inspiring to children, only when adapted to them.

Rabbi Marx—This part of the report is a criticism of the physical make-up of the book. In the present arrangement, you have one section in which you have services for the adult, with a section of services for the Sunday School. I criticize that physical make-up of the book. I put in this paragraph that we should not separate these elements. Furthermore, if you wish this book to be for congregational purposes, then you must begin with your children, to teach them for the congregation. If you wish your committee to prepare a book for the Sunday School, that is another question.

Rabbi Gries—Do you not intend it to be both?

Rabbi Marx—I do not intend to separate the part for the Sabbath School from the congregational part.

Rabbi Gries—I move to strike out the first sentence.

This motion was seconded and carried.

The rest of the paragraph was thereupon adopted.

Recommendation *g* was then read.

Rabbi Stolz—Why is that desired?

Rabbi Marx—It occupies something like forty-two pages. If this were continuously revised as matter presents itself, you would increase the size of the book without changing its physical character. Moreover, there is a great deal of matter that is good for choral work, but not good for congregational work.

Rabbi Stolz—If we can get some very competent organist, especially one familiar with the publications of our own Jewish composers, and can point out to the organist where this music can be purchased, it would be very helpful.

Rabbi Moses—You rob your hymnal and congregations of a very important aid in the worship. We do not need any music, for the congregation does not sing from notes, but it is well to have the words. I am in favor of going to the Bible for our songs—put the entire book of Psalms in. Let the congregation get familiar with the Psalms by singing and chanting them.

Rabbi Gries—I move, that the report be so changed, as to include such anthem texts, as the committee may approve, and that the committee be empowered to include and reprint the index separately.

The motion was seconded and carried.

Recommendation *h* was adopted.

Recommendation *i* was read.

Rabbi Leiser—This recommendation is very important, because the text of the hymns is naturally the subject matter of the song and we from time to time must gather new material. We must have not only the old hymns which have come down through the centuries, but modern Jewish hymns, if these are obtainable. I have tried my hand in this department on more than one occasion; I have written one or two hymns which I would be

pleased to submit to the committee. I urge on the members of the Conference, that they aid this Hymnal Committee in obtaining modern Jewish hymns.

The recommendation was adopted.

Rabbi Harry Mayer—The report was a very thorough one, as we all agree, and is a step in the right direction. We have been considering it for ten years without doing anything. It seems to me, it would be extremely important to examine all the literature of devotion and poetry in German, English and French, that is at all accessible. This would require research in the libraries of Europe. I have done some of this work. In the past two years I have spent more money than I ought, in getting Jewish songs written in different languages. This committee ought to have the finances to send somebody over to the British Museum. They ought to be given the privilege if necessary, that will enable them to spend all the money that would be required. I think that \$500.00 would not be too much. This does not necessarily imply that they are to spend \$500.00. I would therefore move, that this Conference recommend to the Finance Committee, that if necessary, as much as \$500.00 be spent for the purposes of the committee.

Rabbi Levi—Since appropriations are made from year to year, I amend, that it be \$250.00 for the coming year.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I amend, that the committee submit to the Finance Committee, a statement of their needs.

This amendment was seconded and carried.

On motion duly seconded, the whole report as amended, was adopted, and the thanks of the Conference were given to the Chairman, for his splendid and arduous work.

The report of the Committee on Church and State, was read by its Chairman, Rabbi David Lefkowitz.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RELATION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

To the President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on the Relation of Church and State begs leave to report as follows:

Seeking for information as to the present status of sectarianism in the schools of the land, a list of questions covering this matter was sent out by the Committee. 57 answers were received, giving information concerning 53 cities scattered over 32 states.

From these answers we learn that in 35 of these 53 cities there are no Bible readings at the opening exercises of the schools; 8 of the remaining cities have only the reading of the Old Testament, some of the Psalms exclusively. Quite a number of answers report the recitation of the Lord's Prayer. 31 cities report that no sectarian hymns are sung; a large portion of the remainder speak of such hymns as being sung only at Christmas and Easter.

The Committee was very sorry not to have reported to it, in all cases where sectarian hymns were sung from the regular song book of the schools, the titles of such books and the names of the publishers. That such information is extremely valuable to the Committee and to the cause of non-sectarianism will be evident further on in our report.

The educational world has for the past few years been agitated on the matter of a course of ethics or morals in our public schools; hence the Committee felt that it should somehow bring the matter to the attention of the Conference, if not for placing itself on record one way or the other, at least for discussion. The question as to the advisability of such a course was therefore included in our list, and as a result we find that 19 members of the Conference, of the 57 who returned answers, think it advisable; one answering, "Decidedly, yes;" 3 urging it as a study along with civics; 5 of the 19 adding the proviso, "if sectarian coloring could be prevented." 37 deemed such a course inadvisable, some because, they were sure that sectarian bias could not be eliminated from such teaching, some because they felt that ethics should never be separated from religious teaching, some because teachers prepared as they now are could not adequately teach so important and delicate a subject. Most of those who urged the inadvisability of a set course in ethics or morality stated that these subjects inhere in all school studies, and it only requires the true teacher to suggest them to the pupils—that it should be the under-current in all teaching.

Your Committee was asked by the Board of Delegates of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations to act in conjunction with it on the matter of urging the Immigration Commission of the United States to eliminate the classification "Hebrew" from its list of races immigrating to the United States. We put ourselves in communication with the Chairman of the Board of Delegates, who stated that there will be no meeting of the Immigration Commission until December. The immigration authorities at Ellis Island have not receded from their classification. The Census Bureau, however, we learn, which at one time attempted this kind of classification, has been estopped by act of Congress.

At the meeting of the U. A. H. C. at Philadelphia last January, the Board of Delegates was instructed by the Council of the Union to co-operate with your Committee on Church and State toward the publication of literary material supporting the contention that, from a constitutional standpoint, "This is not a Christian country." Your Committee has inquired both of the Chairman of the Board of Delegates and the Secretary of the Union, but it seems they are not ready to enter the work. It appears to the Committee that a tract on this subject will surely be timely, and we recommend that it be made the subject of our next tract.

The Committee has, on a number of occasions during the past year, advised with members of the Conference who were fighting sectarianism in their localities, and has frequently sent copies of the pamphlet, "Why the Bible Should Not be Read in Public Schools," to such places for distribution. We are glad to note that the pamphlet has been used so largely by members of the Conference. In Oklahoma it was sent to the members of the Legislature, and helped to defeat a proposed law making Bible reading in the schools of that state compulsory. Two committees are at present engaged in a contest on the question of sectarianism, and have asked that this report make no mention of the cases until they are settled.

The Executive Committee of the Conference gave to the consideration of this Committee the question of the inadequate, misleading, and often disgraceful accounts of our holy days and holidays that appear in the local newspapers. The Committee feels that this matter can be adjusted if the Rabbis would get in touch with the newspapers of their localities and offer to furnish accounts for them of the holy occasions in our calendar. If the Conference has no other plan to suggest, the Committee should be charged with the duty of urging and reminding all the members of the Conference to prepare such accounts.

While in session at Frankfort, Mich., last year, the Conference was dismayed at the newspaper accounts of July 2, 1908, stating that the National Educational Association, then convened in Cleveland, had declared for the Bible in the public schools. Your Committee questioned the Secretary of the N. E. A. if such a declaration was made, and what was the purport of it. The answer from the Secretary of the Association enclosed the Declarations of Principles of the N. E. A., the 15th article reading:

"It is apparent that familiarity with the English Bible as a masterpiece of literature is rapidly decreasing among the pupils in our schools. This is the direct result of the conception which regards the Bible as a theological book merely, and thereby leads to its exclusion from the schools of some states as a subject of reading and study. We hope for a change of public sentiment in this regard as will permit and encourage the reading and study of the English Bible, as a literary work of the highest and

purest type, side by side with the poetry and prose which it has inspired and in large part formed."

The Secretary writes:

"I am enclosing herewith a copy of the Declaration of Principles adopted at the N. E. A., in convention assembled at Cleveland, Ohio, July 1, 1908. This resolution was passed without dissent at the meeting of the active members held on that date. There was no purpose, so far as I understand, to indicate whether the Bible should be read at the opening exercises of school sessions or in class for the study of literature and subjects related thereto. I am sure, however, that the purpose was to encourage the use of the English Bible more generally along the line of the sentiment expressed in the resolution.

"Sincerely yours,

"IRWIN SHEPARD, *Secretary.*"

The Committee is desirous of hearing of text-books that present sectarian teachings, because a proper appeal to the publishing house from which such a text-book is sent out may bring results more favorable and possibly more speedy than any other method of protest. Your Committee, through its Chairman, sent such protest during the past year to Silver-Burdette Publishing Co., of New York, complaining of a sectarian reading in its Fourth Reader of the "Stepping Stones to Literature" series, and also to Allyn & Bacon of Boston, complaining of the following sentence in Professor West's "Ancient World," a text-book used in the high schools of Chicago: "But, after all, Judaism was an exclusive religion; out of it was to grow the still higher religion of Christianity."

In the answer received from Allyn & Bacon the two following statements show our success:

"We certainly agree that, in a book of this sort, no statement should be included which can give rise to religious controversy. We will at once write to Professor West, and feel sure that he will gladly make a change in the text before the next edition is printed.

"Sincerely yours,

"ALLYN & BACON."

Silver, Burdette & Co. write (November 5, 1909):

"In response to your letter of the 21st, which we have already acknowledged, we are glad to advise you that we have secured the assent of the authors of our "Stepping Stones to Literature" series—having heard from the second author by wire yesterday—to the omission of Helen Hunt Jackson's "The Legend of St. Christopher" from the Fourth Reader of the series. For that selection we are substituting Thackeray's poem entitled "King Canute," and it will appear in all future editions printed.

"We have explained the situation fully, so you may understand that we are heartily in sympathy with the proposition that text-books for public schools should, so far as possible, be entirely non-sectarian."

From these letters it can be seen that possibilities of our best success in the elimination of sectarianism from our public schools lies in the method of presenting the matter to publishing houses. Therefore we urge that our members report to the Committee on Church and State every case that comes to their notice of text-books containing sectarian material.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID LEFKOWITZ,
JOS. KRAUSKOPF,
HENRY COHEN,
M. NEWFIELD,
ABB. SIMON,
WM. FRIEDMAN,
E. FRISCH,
J. B. WISE.

Rabbi Harris—I move a vote of thanks to the Committee for their report, that the report be adopted, and that the recommendations be taken up seriatim.

The motion was carried.

Rabbi Lefkowitz—The first recommendation is, that "From the constitutional standpoint this is not a Christian Country," be made the subject of our next tract.

Rabbi Silverman—I move that this recommendation be referred to the Executive Committee.

The motion was seconded and carried.

Rabbi Lefkowitz—The second recommendation concerns the account of the holidays for the press.

The Chair—Dr. Morgenstern, will you make a statement of your interview with the Associated Press agent on this subject?

Rabbi Morgenstern—I saw the agent in Cincinnati, who put me in communication with headquarters in Chicago. The answer came back, that the Associated press could handle no material of this nature, that the individual papers in the different cities were concerned or were interested, not so much in the presentation of the history or the story of the holy days, as

in the local celebrations and services in the local synagogues, and they would cover these by their own reporters.

Rabbi Frisch—I amend, that a series of short and interesting articles, on the holy days, be written by the Committee on Church and State and be sent to the members of the Conference, and that these articles be localized by each member and handed to the newspapers in his city. This method will meet the case.

The motion was seconded and carried.

Rabbi Silverman—I would like to have the opinion of this Conference on the advisability of dealing with the caricature of the Jew on the stage and in current publications. We are face to face with that in New York all the time. The Jew is being caricatured on the stage almost constantly, and being caricatured by certain publications, which I do not name, because I do not wish to advertise them. I move that the Church and State Committee, take up the matter of the caricature of the Jew on the stage and in current publication.

The motion was seconded and carried.

The Conference then adjourned.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

The paper of Prof. Feldman, "Intermarriage, Historically Considered," was, in the absence of the author, read by Rabbi Krass. (cf Appendix c.) At its conclusion, Rabbi Schulman read his paper, "Mixed Marriages Considered in Their Relation to the Jewish Religion." (cf. Appendix d.)

Before opening the discussion the following telegram, that had just been received, was read:

"Central Conference of American Rabbis, Temple Emanu-El, 43d Street and Fifth Avenue, N. Y.:"

"The Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of New York, in convention assembled, herewith transmits a message of affectionate greeting to the Central Conference of American Rabbis now in session in this city, rejoicing in the heritage of Him who hath made of

one blood all men for to dwell on the face of the whole earth, and cherishing a fervent faith in the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob. (Signed) REV. KARL RULAND, Grace Church, New York; REV. L. W. BAT-
TEN, D. D., St. Mark's Church, New York; REV. GEORGE R. VANDEWATER,
D. D., St. Andrew's Church, New York. *Committee.*"

To this, the following reply, framed by the President, and unanimously approved by the Conference, was returned:

"To the Convention, Protestant Episcopal Church in Diocese of N. Y.:

"The Central Conference of American Rabbis, in convention assembled, appreciate profoundly the message of good will coming from the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of New York. The Conference reciprocates most heartily, and hails this affectionate greeting as a remarkable sign of our present age, when the sentiment of the common brotherhood of all men, as children of the one God, is growing stronger day by day, for have we not all one Father, hath not one God created us? (Signed) DAVID PHILIPSON, *President Central Conference American Rabbis.*"

The discussion of the two papers was then opened by Rabbi I. S. Moses. (cf. Appendix *d*, conclusion.)

On motion of Rabbi Kaplan, duly seconded and carried by a vote of 34 to 33, the discussion was closed. The motion to reconsider, failing of the necessary majority, was lost. The discussion was declared closed. The privilege of the floor was, however, on motion duly seconded and carried, extended to Dr. Kohler.

Rabbi Kohler—I have asked for the privilege of the floor, and I thank my colleagues for having granted it. A word has been spoken by the previous speaker which should not go uncensured. He said that the Jewish people, as a priest people, should not contaminate itself by intermarrying, because, *Lo yittamma' ba'al b'ammov* (Lev. 21, 4). This is a mistake in quotation, and a misstatement in conception. If the Jewish people, as a priest people, does not favor intermarriage, or there is an endeavor to keep distinct, it was never meant in the sense of a possible contamination. The Jewish people have never claimed to be any better than others. Whenever the question of the prohibition of mixed marriage or intermarriage has come up in

the Talmudical literature, it was always only the association with impure thought and heathenism that was considered contaminating—*heathenism* and not the *heathen people*. I do not want such a misstatement even considered as spoken. The Jewish people is a priest people, but only in the religious sense, and therefore, the question of proselytism and intermarriage, was always considered only from the viewpoint of the maintenance of the Jewish faith in its purity, and from no other.

The following committees were announced:

On Thanks: S. Hirshberg, Chairman, Alexander, Brill, S. Cohen, Fleischer, Greenburg, Landau, F. Levy.

On Nominations: Gries, Chairman, Feuerlicht, Fineshriber, Foster, Frankin, Harris, Krass, H. H. Mayer, Salzman.

The following report of the special committee, appointed on the preceding day, was read:

"The undersigned committee, appointed to consider the letter of Mr. Lauterbach on the question of Jewish chaplains in the United States army and navy, recommend that Mr. A. W. Levy be given the privilege of the floor for not more than twenty minutes, to address the convention on ways and means to provide chaplains for the Jewish soldiers and sailors in the service of the United States.

"(Signed) G. DEUTSCH,

"EDWARD N. CALISCH,

"JACOB H. KAPLAN."

A motion was made and duly seconded to amend the report of the committee, that he be given ten minutes Monday afternoon. Carried.

The report of the Committee on Sermonic Literature, was presented by its chairman, Rabbi Samuel Hirshberg, and was on motion, duly seconded and carried, received and referred to the Executive Committee.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SERMONIC LITERATURE.

GENTLEMEN: The Committee on Sermonic Literature begs leave to report that it issued in season for the last holidays a pamphlet of six holiday sermons, contributed by Rabbis Schulman, George Solomon, Krass, Bottigheimer, Guttmacher and Kornfeld. The number of these

pamphlets, by direction of the Executive Committee, was limited to five hundred, distributed among members of the Conference and applicants of previous years, whose names were on the mailing-list of the Conference. The members of the Conference will assist materially in furthering the purpose and realizing the service for which these pamphlets are issued by sending for addition to the mailing-list the names of leaders in small country communities, which might benefit by having such sermons for their religious edification during the holiday season. As it is, even small as the last edition was, and with two hundred pamphlets moreover distributed among members of the Conference, as many again were left, according to the report of Bloch & Co., to adorn the shelves of their establishment. So small appears to be the actual demand for these sermons, and that, too, after an earnest effort to bring them to the attention of possible beneficiaries was made by repeated advertisements in the Jewish press.

The Chairman of this Committee regrets to again be compelled to make complaint that he was obliged to wait for sermons promised for the pamphlet, and that, too, after repeated reminders to the promisers, until almost the very eve of the holidays themselves. On behalf of his successor and his associates of the Committee, he would appeal to the members to be more prompt in this matter. In fact, he would ask them to volunteer sermons without being requested for them, and that, furthermore, while the glow of satisfaction is still ardent with them over the surpassing excellence, and the remarkable merit of the sermons they have so recently delivered, and which doubtless made them such notable life-efforts in the experience of each.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL HIRSHBERG, *Chairman*,

GEORGE SOLOMON,

NATHAN KRASS.

Rabbi Calisch—I wish to say in connection with the report, that the sermons do not reach the people for whom intended. I have had some experience, being the originator of this sermonic movement. The only way to reach these people is to let them know that these sermons are being printed for them. When I had the matter in charge, I advertised in the newspapers, six weeks before the holidays, that these sermons could be had upon application. This is an age of publicity, therefore, they should let it be known that these sermons are to be had, and they will find a surprising demand. Secondly, I desire to say of most of the sermons issued, that they are not sermons suitable for

the purpose for which intended, the country Jew. They are too high toned. They do not reach the spot. They for the most part are discussions of philosophical matters, entirely above the intelligence or comprehension of those for whom they are intended. I beg the Committee to strive for simplicity in these sermons.

Rabbi Landau—I received a request a day or two before last Rosh Hashona from two small places in Pennsylvania for these sermons. To one community, I sent the sheaf of holiday sermons by Dr. Philipson and to the other congregation, I sent some manuscript of my own. Now I am of the opinion, from what I have just heard, that we have quite a wealth of material left on the shelf in one direction, and a want in the other. That it meets a need, I am perfectly sure. I would suggest, and possibly my suggestion has been incorporated in the report, that a copy or two copies of these admirable productions, be sent by the individual members of the Conference to the places where needed.

Rabbi Hirshberg—One copy was sent to every member of the Conference.

Rabbi Landau—Then I have nothing to say.

Rabbi Stolz—We print the sermons; they are intended for a certain class of people, yet they do not get to the place where they can do good. They have been advertised for years, and as a result twelve or fifteen congregations express their desire for them. I have no doubt that there are hundreds of places where services are conducted by laymen during the holidays. These sermons are printed for their use. If there is any way of bringing these sermons to the people for whom they are intended, let us try to reach them.

Rabbi Sadler—I would be very sorry if the publication of these holiday sermons were discontinued. I have always ordered the holiday sermons from the beginning of their publication, have examined them carefully, and found them very useful, because the subject matter was not confined to the holiday themes merely, but can also be used during the entire year, especially by the

smaller congregations of the country. For the country Jews have plenty of time to read them and profit by them. I would suggest they be sent to those congregations started under the auspices of the synagogue extension movement. These usually only hold services twice a month. They could hold them every week, if they had some sermons to read to their congregations.

Rabbi Eli Mayer—I would suggest further to the Executive Committee, that in distributing these pamphlets they might get the assistance of such organizations as the Jewish Publication Society and the Jewish Chautauqua Society, who send out paid officers and have lists of names.

Rabbi Jasin—I think one of the answers to this question, is an answer which might apply to other difficulties in regard to distributing literature and getting the attention of the congregations to matters that the Conference wants to bring before them. Very often it happens that some circular letter is sent to the President or Secretary of the congregation. It is not always the case that the Secretary and President are the most actively interested members in the congregation. In many cases men who hold no office in the congregation are far more interested. The Conference should try to find out these men. I know as a matter of fact, that very often the Secretary and President of the congregation throw things away, while some one, not an officer, finds out about them and does more for them than the officers. I think we should try and get a catalogue of such men.

Rabbi Stern—I suggest that a copy of the sermons be sent to all penal institutions, and state prisons of the land. As Chaplain of the New Jersey State Prison my experience has been, that men frequently come and ask me, whether I can give them some simple theme, some simple book, whereby they might be led to a better understanding of their faith. We should get a list of all the reformatories and penal institutions throughout the land, to each of which a copy of our publications should be sent.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I am not fully conversant with the actual question before the Conference, but from the discussion I have

heard, since I came in, I would suggest that the Committee on Sermonic Literature be instructed to devise some plan for a wider and more effective distribution of our sermonic literature and submit this plan to the next Conference for consideration.

The Chair—Might I suggest this, that the Committee on Sermonic Literature be instructed to write to every member of the Conference for suggestions, and then formulate some plan, and report to the Executive Committee.

Rabbi Hirshberg—The Committee will accept that suggestion.

FRIDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 12, 1909.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a. m., at Temple Beth-El, and was opened by prayer by Rabbi Leiser. The minutes of the sessions of the preceding day were read and approved.

The report of the Committee of Instruction of Blind, Deaf Mutes, etc., was read by the Chairman, Rabbi Simon.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION OF BLIND, DEAF MUTES, ETC.

NOVEMBER 1, 1909.

To the President and Members of the Central Conference American Rabbis:

The report of this Committee includes a brief consideration of six different classes of American Israel:

- (1) The Defectives, comprising the deaf, mute, blind, insane and epileptic.
- (2) The Dependents—children and adults in asylums and old folks' homes.
- (3) The Delinquents—children and adults in protectories, houses of refuge, jails and penitentiaries.
- (4) The Farmer.
- (5) The Workingman.
- (6) The Enlisted Soldier.

While philanthropic societies and state organizations have for a long

while addressed themselves to an alleviation of the material, social and mental handicaps of the unfortunate, the satisfaction of their religious cravings by organizations and churches has been of very recent date. In this latter respect the Jew has fallen behind the Christian neighbor. It is only within the past few years that the condition of the Jewish deaf, blind and insane in the United States became aggravated enough to dignify it into the proportions of a problem, nor need we even now quail before it.

Defectives.

A questionnaire to two hundred individuals, including rabbis and heads of various philanthropic societies, brought forth the following facts, briefly stated: Only the very large centers of Jewish population have need of societies or of men to look after the religious life of the defectives. It is fair to assume that the Jewish deaf-mute population in our country is about 1,600, and that 1,000 of this number reside in Greater New York. In Greater New York we have 120 Jewish children in the Horeb Institute, 200 in the 163d Street School, supposedly non-sectarian, and a Jewish Deaf-Mute Congregation of about 200. The credit for this constructive work lies with Rev. Dr. Pereira Mendes, and the general religious fortunes of the defectives are also in the care of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations. Rabbi Aaron Eiseman and Mr. Samuel Cohen, a lay reader. In Philadelphia a congregation of 35 deaf mutes is in charge of Rabbi Marvin Nathan, who sees to it that the Jewish children of the Pennsylvania Institute for the Deaf and Dumb in Philadelphia come to his synagogue from time to time and participate in the celebration of the holidays. For three years Rev. Dr. Louis Grossman conducted a class of twelve in his school, while similar classes were for a time under the care of Drs. Stolz and Schanfarber in Chicago. The Jewish inmates of the State Institution in Ohio receive especial visits and instruction from Mr. Harry Kahn of Columbus. The number of Jewish deaf in other cities from which I have reports is so small as to be almost negligible, yet it is pleasant to note that the religious wants of these few are attended to by the rabbis and societies.

The insane among our people can be estimated only roughly. Rev. Dr. Blum, the chaplain, states that New York State registers 1,800 Jewish insane out of a total of 29,000. In the Craig Colony for Epileptics 110 out of 1,300 are Jews, an alarming 10 percent. His last report, dated October, 1909, to the New York Board of Jewish Ministers, mentions 15 different hospitals, Jewish and non-Jewish, which treated in one year a total of 10,000 Jews. Outside of New York State, the State Institutions for the Insane in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois and St. Louis contain a large number of our people. Rabbis have been acting as self-appointed chaplains in several cities, and, together with the helpfulness of the local Councils of Jewish Women, Temple Auxiliaries, Federated Charities, have brought them the ministries of Judaism. In New York Rev. Dr. Blum, in

Boston Rabbi Louis Alexander, in Chicago Rabbi Marcus, are officially appointed and salaried chaplains to look after the religious needs of our constituents among the defectives. The Jewish blind are very few and far between in all cities outside of New York, in which city Miss Sadie American reports at least 150 who are receiving the aid and comfort of the local Council, but for whom as yet no special religious work is done.

The special report on "Religious Work for Dependents and Defectives in Jewish Institutions," by Rabbi Simon Peiser, in Vol. XVII of the Conference Year-Book, is herewith appended to our report, with the additional information concerning thirteen "Homes for the Aged." The exact

number of all our Jewish inmates in these institutions is at hand. But it is still more important to note that the religious education of five thousand Jewish children in the sixteen Jewish Institutional Homes in our country is by no means behind the work accomplished in our temple Sabbath-Schools. Our 13 Jewish Homes for the Aged throughout the country give shelter to about 850 of our people, where services are held every Sabbath, and where Chanukah, Purim and Pesach become special occasions for festive gatherings and entertainments. Very little information is obtainable concerning the number of Jews in Jewish and non-Jewish hospitals, whether supported by the State, city or private endowment. Some rabbis reported that frequent visits, even to Jewish hospitals, brought forth the fact that neither Bible nor Prayer-Book was at hand.

Orphan Asylums.

Jewish O. A., Los Angeles, Cal.	55
Hebrew O. A., New York (corrected)	1,805
Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, New York (corrected) ..	1,250

Protectories.

Jewish Protectory, Hawthorn, New York	183
---------------------------------------------	-----

Old Homes.

Jewish Shelter Home for the Homeless and Aged, Baltimore...	No report
Home for the Jewish Aged, Chicago	73
Home for A. J. I. O. B. B., Yonkers, N. Y.	74
Home for A. J. I. (Orthod.) Beth Moshab Z'kainim, Chicago..	90
Home for A. J., San Francisco	33
Home for A. J., Cincinnati, O.	38
Montefiore Home, Cleveland, O.	44
Beth M. Z., Cleveland, O.	14
Leopold Morse Home, Mattapan, Mass.	7

[illegible]

Home for the Aged and Infirm Hebrews, New York.....	305
Hebrew Shelter House and Home for the Aged, New York.....	No report
Home of the A. A. I. Israelites, Philadelphia.....	44
Beth M. Z. (Home of A. H.) Pittsburgh.....	36

Since our last meeting at Frankfort, Mich., the problem of the Jewish Delinquent has received more than ordinary attention. Commissioner

Delinquents.

Bingham's article in the *North American Review* of September, 1908, at first almost staggering in its effects, fortunately proved to have been grossly exaggerated. Yet, at the same time, it did not fail to open the eyes of those who had been rather indifferent to the problem of criminality among Jews and the possible consequences it may have both to the American Jew and to those of our unfortunate brethren who seek these shores as the only refuge from foreign persecutions. The fact that even "the stone wall of Judaism" has proven too weak to withstand the attacks of the modern social conditions may not call for an apology from Judaism, but it certainly calls on us to repair its breaches with the same earnestness that characterizes this redemptive work among the followers of other faiths in behalf of their erring co-religionists.

Fortunately the Jew has a rather easy task in the matter of reforming his delinquents, since the majority of them are not incorrigible. The vice of most Jewish delinquents may well be defined as "false moral arithmetic." They sought what to them appeared the path of least resistance. This fact is not stated as an excuse for delinquency among Jews or to minimize the gravity of the crimes committed by those professing the Jewish faith, but merely to serve as an additional incentive to put forth our best efforts to reform the offender, since it gives us the assurance that it will not be altogether love's labor lost. But there is a terrible downward pull exerted by the association with more hardened criminals. And for that reason there must be some spiritual influences to counteract the evil effects of this environment. But without the necessary agencies for reformation while in the prison, and prospect of rehabilitation after his discharge, the Jewish prisoner is indeed a "prisoner without hope."

At the present time there are only a few of the largest centers of Jewish population which have Jewish chaplains giving their entire time and thought to the care of Jewish delinquents. With these notable exceptions this work is done, or left undone, by the rabbis ministering in cities where the penal institutions are located. That an occasional visit and sermon by the rabbi is helpful cannot be gainsaid, but it can accomplish very little lasting good. To do this work effectively requires thorough efficiency, con-

siderable influence, and a great deal of time on the part of the ones doing it.

In order to reach the criminal one must thoroughly understand his psychology, which is not normal. It is doubtful whether there is a criminal who could not be successfully appealed to, if we could only discover the one avenue of approach to his heart. Observation here, as elsewhere, therefore, is essential to a successful diagnosis. Only those who are at all familiar with criminal nature can appreciate the difficulty of getting the subject to co-operate with you. Very often he will deliberately throw you off the right track. An amateur reformer has no chance with a professional crook.

In our dealings with the criminal we must always bear in mind that selfishness is the dominant trait in his character. In proportion as the chaplain interests himself in the improvement of the material conditions of the prisoners will he influence them morally and religiously. He is a bearer of good tidings first, and the proclaimer of peace next. When a prisoner wants a transfer from one shop to another he appeals to the chaplain. He looks to the latter to assist him to obtain a commutation of sentence or pardon. In short, if the chaplain would make something of the prisoner, he must be able to do something for him. That, of course, requires considerable influence with the prison authorities and state officials, which only a regularly appointed chaplain can and should have. In the hands of one unacquainted with the criminal such an influence, used injudiciously, might be a source of danger to the state. But even if the rabbi have both the necessary qualification for this work and the required influence as well, he will nevertheless be unable to do it thoroughly, since he cannot give it the necessary time. For, be the number of Jewish inmates in any penal institution ever so small, they will not be brought back into the fold by having only a bi-weekly, monthly or semi-annual visit of the good shepherd.

Besides, we have also the juvenile delinquent—that poor child without a home. In most cases the wretched waif never had a home. The parents may even belong to the synagogue, and observe the dietary laws, and yet be unworthy of the sacred trust, which the child is and should be to every father and mother. Many a little boy or girl you see out on cold evenings as late as ten o'clock, begging of you to buy a paper or a package of chewing gum, who has been warned not to come home unless it can bring a certain sum of money. Little wonder that these children will often resort to stealing to escape the threatened punishment. But, snatched from the jaws of hell by a timely arrest, they are put into a reform school with all sorts of degenerate children, whose association cannot but exert an influence for bad over them. Surely these lambs—some of these children in the reformatories being less than ten years of age—are in greater need of love than law. These children need not so much a strict task-master as a lov-

ing shepherd. Jewish children will not be understood by nor understand the shepherd of any but their own faith, and cannot, therefore, be benefited by their instruction.

These facts, though hardly giving an adequate idea of the gravity of the problem of Jewish delinquents, are sufficiently convincing as to the need of having competent men and women, whose life is dedicated to this good work, take charge of the prisoner. One man like the lamented Dr. Radin, the lover of humanity, can save more souls than could a score of inexperienced, though equally generous, volunteer social workers. Realizing this, the I. O. B. B., District No. 2, at their convention in Dayton, resolved that the General Committee of the District take steps to have visitors appointed in the several states of the District whose duty it shall be to regularly visit the Jewish inmates within the penal and corrective institutions, and bring about, if possible, their reformation, and secure their rehabilitation, and restoration to self-respect and self-support after their discharge.

The number of Jews in penal institutions in our country is proportionately very small, but even that is far too large. The good work of the special chaplains to the delinquents, such as Rabbi Jacob Goldstein (successor to Dr. Radin), Rabbi Marcus in Chicago, Rabbi Adolph Guttman in Syracuse, and Dr. Nathan Stern in Trenton, all the more assures us of the need of strengthening our forces for the redemptive work of the delinquent. In some cities regular visits are paid and services held in jails and penitentiaries by the rabbis; matzos and Prayer-Books are supplied in some cases. The Hebrew Sunday-School Society of Philadelphia has classes for religious instruction in both the Boys' House of Refuge and the Girls' House of Refuge. In nearly every large city some such similar effort is made to lead the erring and the wayward back to rectitude. With regard to these three classes of defectives, dependents and delinquents, your Committee recommends:

- (a) That the rabbis, in their various communities, make special efforts to satisfy the religious needs of these unfortunates by inviting them to the Sabbath-School and services, and by sending them necessary literature.
- (b) That the Executive Committee suggest to the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College the advisability of arranging a special course for the rabbinical training of such Jewish deaf as would desire to make religious education among the Jewish deaf their life's work.
- (c) We reaffirm the conviction of this Conference made two years ago, that the rabbis urge upon capable Jewish men and women the advisability of preparing themselves to take charge of Jewish philanthropic and educational institutions.

- (d) We further recommend that, wherever possible, the various congregations of a state unite upon the employment of a special Jewish state chaplain or chaplains, to visit, hold services and conduct religious education of our inmates in the three classes above mentioned. "

We add to this report the consideration of the religious life of three other classes in American Israel, which do not properly come under the original title of this Committee, and we present them as separate and individual reports.

That Judaism and Jewish literature have a very keen interest in, sympathy for, and message to, the laboring man of today is too obvious to need more than this mere statement. The number

The Workingman.

of Jewish workmen is on the steady increase, and their failure of active identification with the life of the synagogue is as notorious with us as the condition of the Christian workingman is in the Church at large. The gist of an interview with Mr. Samuel Gompers is here stated without any comment: The American Federation of Labor is not anti-religious in method or purpose. It encourages its members in the satisfaction of their religious needs. Its conventions are opened with prayer, and a fraternal delegate is the reconciling power which brings the message of the Church to the union, and *vice versa*. While the theoretical position of religion stands for the dignity of labor and for the equal sonship of all the children of God, yet its institutionalized forms and practices have been unsympathetic to the workingman. The attitude of the Church has been one of condescending pity, not of whole-hearted co-operation and sympathy. The Church is allied to the money interests, and it is basically capitalistic. Clergymen, as a rule, secure their information concerning the laborer's wants and rights from books and articles written from the standpoint of the laborer's opponents. The dues of membership in churches are prohibitively high, and thus perpetuate in the Church the social classes existing outside the Church. The Jewish laborer who has come hither from Russia and Roumania very readily translates political tyranny in terms of industrial and ecclesiastical tyranny, and soon learns to view the synagogue as another abridgment of his liberties.

Without attempting an answer to the questions which these statements raise, we are certain that the modern Jewish congregation cannot close its eyes with impunity to the whole or partial alienation of the workingman from the influence of the synagogue.

We recommend that:

- (a) The Conference of American Rabbis issue a tract on the "Relation of Judaism and the Synagog to Labor and the Laborer," and give it the very widest publicity.
- (b) We recommend the adoption of "Labor Sabbath" on the first Sab-

bath in May for the public exposition by the rabbis of themes of this or kindred character.

- (c) We recommend that rabbis urge upon their congregations the adoption of such measures as will tend to democratize congregational methods of membership entrance and congregational activities.

It is very gratifying to note the increase in the number of our people who are leading the agricultural life. The recent Agricultural

The Farmer.

Fair held in New York under the combined auspices of all the Jewish Agricultural Societies of America was a most eloquent testimony. There are about 5,000 Jewish farmers in the United States, making a population of at least 20,000 who are living off the produce of the farms. In addition thereto there are 78 Jewish students in the Baron de Hirsch School in Woodbine, N. J., 65 in the National Farm School, and about 50 in the different agricultural colleges at Cornell University, Storrs, Conn., Amherst, Mass., etc., not counting the great number who have already graduated from the two Jewish and the several non-Jewish colleges. This makes a total of which we need not be ashamed.

But the religious life of the farmer must be fed. The old religious passion of the tiller of the soil, of whom is the kingdom of the Bible, has not lost its fire even in our day and our country. The Jewish farmer longs for companionship. He misses the pilgrimages to Jewish homes and houses of worship. Distance from centers of Jewish interest makes him lonesome, and he longs for the crowded marts, where it is easier to meet his fellows, secure Kosher meat and observe the religious rites. We must, as far as it lies in our power, bring some of the religious advantages of the city to the tillers of the soil. That the leaders of the various agricultural movements realize that the time has come for meeting the religious needs of the Jewish farmers is clear from these replies. Rabbi A. R. Levy of Chicago says: "As to religious education, I am sorry to say that very little, if anything, is done to have them instructed in their faith. It is hard to say what the Central Conference of American Rabbis can do to bring about a more desirable result so far as the religious education of these children is concerned. One thing, however, is evident; something should be done to bring these children, as well as their parents, under the influence of a sound religious education." Mr. Henry W. Geller, superintendent of the Baron de Hirsch Agricultural School in Woodbine, N. J., writes: "In answer to your question we would gladly appreciate up-to-date lectures by intelligent rabbis on any topic of interest, and if the Central Conference of American Rabbis would be willing to assist us in this direction I shall be pleased to negotiate with you further." Mr. J. W. Pincus, Secretary of the Federation of Jewish Farmers of America, writes: "One of the resolutions passed at the last Conference of the Federation of Jewish Farmers of America reads: '*Resolved*, That the Federation should

assist the local branches in securing Yiddish teachers by placing them in communication with agencies in existence for that purpose.' In my capacity as editor of *The Jewish Farmer* I have come into frequent touch with the farmers living in the Eastern states, and many of them complain to me of the lack of facilities in the religious training of their children and of their inability to secure proper teachers on account of lack of means. I certainly am willing to do all I can to co-operate with your Association in extending this religious training to the children of Jewish Farmers."

We recommend that the Conference, through its Committee, enter into communication with these three gentlemen, with a view to ascertaining definitely the best method of helping the religious life of the farmer. We further recommend that, inasmuch as *The Jewish Farmer*, as a periodical, is the best and only medium of communication, we should endeavor to secure a few columns of it to contain occasional Jewish educational material.

It was deemed wise to add an item concerning the needs of the Jewish soldier and sailor to this already too bulky report. Our reasons for so doing are not only that their needs should not be

The Enlisted Soldier. ignored, but also because the question of a Jewish chaplain has been agitated for some time in the

press, and ought to receive serious debate at the hands of our Conference. It is very difficult to ascertain the number of Jews in the various army posts, yet the commandants are anxious to be of service to the rabbis in securing desirable information, and are desirous that the soldiers enjoy the social and religious advantages of their specific denominations. It is the Jewish soldier himself who is loth to announce his Jewish affiliation. Where a goodly number of Jews are in one post the members are open in the avowal of their religious loyalties, but paucity of numbers invariably goes hand in hand with extreme reluctance to declare themselves. Rabbis report that the soldiers visit their temples from time to time, but none outside of Rabbi Liknaitz of Leavenworth, Kan., makes any forward effort to bring them the ministrations of Judaism. Generally speaking, we must go to them, and urge their attendance at our services and their participation in our holiday services, no less than secure for them necessary literature and prayer-books. A letter from the rabbi to the men in charge of a post will always bring a very respectful permission for the Jewish soldiers to attend services. It is our opinion that, for the present, the rabbi in the city where the army posts are located can adequately fill the place of the regularly officiated army chaplain.

Respectfully submitted,

ABRAM SIMON, *Chairman*,
DAVID BLAUSTEIN,
JOSEPH S. KORNFELD,
SOLOMON C. LOWENSTEIN,
SIMON PEISER.

Rabbi Stolz--I move that this report be taken up in four sections at four different times; that we first take up that portion referring to the blind, deaf mutes, etc., then that portion referring to the workmen when we have that matter discussed; the portion referring to the soldiers and sailors in connection with the address that is to be given us Monday afternoon; and that the portion referring to the farmer, be taken at the time the Conference takes up the portion of the President's message on that subject

The motion was seconded and carried.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I move that since the regular program of the day must begin very soon, we defer the discussion of the first part of the report until just preceding the time to which the second portion has been assigned. Carried.

The report of the Committee on Lyceum Bureau, was presented by its Chairman, Rabbi Leo M. Frankin, and on motion was taken up *seriatim*.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON LYCEUM BUREAU.

To the Officers and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

When, two years ago, the Committee on Social and Religious Union of this Conference recommended the establishment of a Lyceum Bureau of Jewish Lectures, it had in mind the need not only of carrying the message of Judaism to a wider circle, but more particularly of giving to organizations nominally Jewish the incentive to carry on work that was Jewish in fact. Noting existing conditions in the larger and the smaller cities of this country, it was apparent that lodges, clubs and other organizations calling themselves Jewish or Hebrew were so only in name, and that the work they did might as well have been carried on, so far as its Jewish character was concerned, by organizations affiliated with the church, or for that matter without any religious affiliation whatsoever. Even congregations were accustomed to give entertainments that, by the utmost stretch of the imagination, could not be regarded as fitting in the house of God nor of a kind appropriate for presentation under congregational auspices. But it was reasoned that if an opportunity were given to these same organizations to hear Jewish themes discussed by men fitted by character and training to discuss them, they would gladly enough substitute for the unworthy entertainments, to which they were accustomed, lectures by Jewish scholars.

Although in the two years that the Lyceum Bureau has been in existence we cannot say this hope has been fully realized, and although the actual number of lectures delivered under the auspices of this Bureau has been comparatively small, we yet have the satisfaction of knowing that the work undertaken by us has not been without a direct and telling influence in many quarters. Indeed, the surprise has been not that we have done so little in these two years, but rather, that we have done so much in a comparatively short time, and with the very limited means at our disposal for giving the work that publicity which it ought to have.

During the past year the Chairman of this Committee has been in correspondence with representatives of sixteen cities, regarding the possible institution of a course of Jewish lectures under the auspices of this Bureau. Unfortunately arrangements were completed this season with but two of these cities, but it is gratifying nonetheless to know that, while our Committee did not in the other cases actually arrange lecture courses, we did *inspire* them, and thus the real purpose for which we are organized was fully achieved. I might, in passing, say that it is hardly fair for communities to use the good offices of this Bureau in getting suggestions as to lectures and topics and then complete arrangements independently. It is not that the small fee which is thus saved to the community is a matter of consideration, but it takes away from our Bureau the credit of having done work for which in very truth it alone is responsible. But even more reprehensible, it seems to me, is the attitude that has been taken by some of our colleagues. They have permitted their names to appear in our prospectus, and we have initiated lecture engagements for them which they of their own accord have completed. Under the resolution adopted at the last Conference, every lecturer making engagements through this Bureau is supposed to pay a fee of one dollar to the Conference to cover expense of printing and postage, but, as is obvious, where men complete their own arrangements they cannot be called upon to pay this nominal fee, and in no instance have they volunteered to do so. However, I am charitable enough to believe that, where this lapse has occurred, it has been due rather to negligence than to a willful disregard of professional ethics, and the mere calling of attention to it will, no doubt, prevent its recurrence hereafter.

In addition to the cities in which lecture courses were actually arranged by us, a number of communities have asked for our prospectus, but whether direct use was made of it we have no means of knowing. On the whole, your Committee is perfectly satisfied with the results thus far attained, and we urge the Conference and its members to give the work their further support and assistance. May I suggest, also, in passing, that a more liberal attitude in regard to the fees asked by some of our men would very greatly help in popularizing the work for which the Bureau stands. While your Committee fully realize that the work should

be reasonably compensated, we do yet feel that some considerable sacrifice should be made for the good of the cause, and that, when congregations in small communities are anxious to hear a Jewish message, but are unable, as some communities are, to pay a large fee for the service, that the rabbi should be willing to render his services for a small remuneration. It should be stated, in justice to some of our colleagues, that they have been willing, and have, indeed, lectured under the auspices of the Bureau for the mere payment of expenses.

What has perhaps, more than anything else, militated against the broadening of our work, has been the fact that we have been hampered by a lack of funds. Work of this kind needs the widest possible publicity, and while, as a rule, the Jewish papers of this country are courteous and considerate, we find that, unless some of our notices are paid for at advertising rates, there is a manifest unwillingness on the part of the publishers to give publicity to the notices of our work which are sent to them. I do not say this by way of criticism of the publishers, for, after all, the publication of a Jewish journal is not, as a rule, an overly profitable adventure, and I mention it simply to urge, if you can see your way clear to do it, to make a larger allowance to your Committee than heretofore to carry on the campaign of publicity.

In my last report I urged that others than members of our Conference be included in the list of speakers who may register with our Bureau, but that recommendation was referred back to our Committee with the instruction that we bring before the Conference a more definite plan of carrying the suggestion into effect. We therefore renew our recommendation at this time, and ask for favorable action upon it. In many instances your Committee has learned that Jewish communities prefer a course of lectures in which some of the participants are laymen of eminence and ability, and it is with the idea of meeting this desire that Jewish men and women eminent in their own fields of work be added, with their consent, to the list of speakers to be included in our next prospectus. To carry this plan into effect it would be the purpose of your Committee to correspond with prominent Jewish teachers in the various colleges of the country, with Jewish artists and musicians of note, who could discuss from the public platform the bearing of their particular art or science upon Jewish life, and present in attractive form the part that Jews have had in upbuilding these various arts and sciences. I may say to you that, during the past year, I have received requests for registration with our Bureau from a number of persons not rabbis, of high standing in literature and the arts. We therefore recommend:

- (a) That your Committee be permitted to register persons of undoubted ability and authority in their particular spheres with the Bureau.

- (b) That in order to increase the efficiency of the Bureau, and also to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, this Committee be instructed to gather statistics, on blanks to be prepared for the purpose, of all activities along the lines fostered by this Bureau, that are carried on by congregations represented in this Conference, and, so far as possible, by Jewish lodges, Councils of Jewish Women, and other similar organizations; and that ways and means be devised for a more cordial co-operation between this Bureau and other institutions that are interested in the work which it is the province of this Bureau to foster.
- (c) That the resolution adopted at the last Conference, to the effect that every lecturer registered with the Bureau charge a fee of one dollar, to be applied to the running expenses of the Lyceum Bureau, be rescinded, and that instead thereof a registration fee of one dollar for members and of two dollars for non-members of the Conference, who may register with the Bureau, be charged.*
- (d) That as liberal an appropriation[●] as possible, not to exceed two hundred dollars, be made to carry on the work for the present year.
- (e) That, as heretofore, no names be included in the forthcoming prospectus unless they be accompanied by definite lecture subjects.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

LEO M. FRANKLIN,

Chairman.

Recommendation *a* was taken up.

Rabbi Morgenstern—This matter of the Lyceum Bureau is still in its infancy and is comparatively untried. We have many rabbis on our list, a great number of whom have not had an opportunity to speak. It is, therefore, rather questionable, whether we should add other names. I believe until this matter is tried out more thoroughly we should continue our present policy. I feel that the recommendation of the committee is ill-advised.

Rabbi Franklin—A number of rabbis would have been given a lectureship under this bureau had they been as generous in giving their services as a number of laymen have been. If we

* This recommendation was amended, cf. below.

could have used a number of prominent members not rabbis, we could have had their services.

The motion was duly seconded and carried.

Rabbi Gries—I move as an amendment, that \$1.00 be the registration fee for both rabbis and laymen.

The motion was duly seconded and carried.

The report was adopted as a whole.

The report of the Committee on Religious Schools was presented by its chairman, Rabbi Moses J. Gries, and on motion, was accepted and taken up seriatim.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS.

To the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on Religious Schools believes it to be very important that we, the rabbis, should study the whole problem of Jewish religious education, endeavoring to define its principles, to discover and develop the best methods of instruction, to utilize and create the best material for teacher and pupil and class-room, to perfect the organization of our schools, and to establish a closer and larger co-operation of rabbis and congregations on behalf of religious education. Your Committee conceives it to be the duty of the Conference not only to contribute toward the solution of the problem of the individual schools, but also to point the way toward the formation and execution of plans which may solve the larger problem, belonging to all rabbis and all congregations, viz., the religious education of every Jewish child.

It is the hope of the Committee that the program of this year may make clear the province of the school and present a just estimate of the existing text-books available for the teaching of Biblical history, post-Biblical history, Hebrew and ethics. The comparative study and the discussion of the curricula of our religious schools should help to a clearer understanding of our teaching problem. It is the purpose of the exhibit to afford the opportunity for an examination of all material of possible value to the Jewish Religious School, teacher and pupil.

Through the study of both the theory and the practice of teaching, it should be our endeavor to raise the standard, to increase the efficiency and to enlarge the influence of our religious schools.

The Committee offer the following recommendations, and ask for them the favorable consideration and formal approval of the Conference:

1st. That it be the duty of the Committee on Religious Schools, each

year, to submit a tentative program for Religious School Day, such program to be approved by the Executive Committee.

2d. That the Committee be requested to have prepared and submitted to the next Conference an Outline of Lessons for Confirmation Classes.*

3d. That new Religious School publications shall be reviewed from year to year, as the Committee may determine.

4th. That the Conference have prepared a Sabbath-School Transfer Card, to be furnished, upon request, to the rabbis, members of the Conference. Through this card it is planned that a child moving from one city to another will receive proper credit for years of attendance and work done in former schools.

5th. That authorization be given for the taking of a census of Jewish children of school age, both the plan and the necessary expenditure to be submitted to and approved by the Executive Committee.

6th. That the Committee on Religious Schools present an annual report concerning the state of Jewish religious education throughout the country, including a census of its extent and a study of the standards and methods of our schools.

It is very important that we should know more definitely what we are now doing, and also what we are not doing—how many Jewish children, in private schools and in public institutions, are not receiving Jewish religious education—and how many children in the scattered communities, and most particularly in the large cities, are not receiving proper religious instruction. We should plan for better organization and for united effort in the cities and in the states.

7th. That the Committee be empowered to urge, and perhaps arrange for, the reprint of illustrations in the Jewish Encyclopedia and in other publications, illustrations which have a direct value for the teaching of Jewish history, the expense to be approved by the Executive Committee.

It is the general program of the Committee to bring before the Conference such reports and plans as may lead to the raising of the standard of our schools, the discovery of the value of new methods and material, and the introduction thereof into the schools of the country—to awaken individual and congregational interest so that we may do our full duty with reference to this all-important problem of religious education.

8th. Keenly conscious of the great benefits that will accrue to the cause of Jewish Religious Education by the establishment of teachers' colleges, through the munificence of Mr. Jacob H. Schiff, the Committee recommends that this Conference extend to him its sincere appreciation.

MOSES J. GRIES,

Chairman.

* This recommendation was amended, cf. below.

The first recommendation was adopted.

The second recommendation was read.

Rabbi Gries—I will explain just what that means. We have a number of different text-books that are used for confirmation class work. But it seems that either some rabbis have notes they dictate to the children or they give them all the work, and the children have nothing in their hands. Consequently, there is a good deal of confusion. The intention is, that we try to, have prepared an outline of lessons that the teacher can use as a basis of instruction and the child can use to help remember the instruction given in the confirmation class. The resolution asks, that the committee prepare and offer to the next Conference such a report.

Rabbi Hirsch—I believe, if my experience is of any account, that the rabbis as a rule, teach the confirmation class themselves. Now, whether it is right or wrong, the individuality of a rabbi is sometimes of a kind that he cannot use a text-book; for a text-book or an outline of lessons prepared by any brother of his, will probably not satisfy in every regard what he, the individual rabbi, deems essential. For this reason, I do not see the urgent necessity of preparing such a leaflet, as far as it concerns the instruction of confirmation classes, by the rabbis themselves. Of course we have scattered throughout the country, smaller communities that are still in a state of the Garden of Eden innocence, insofar as they have not been invaded by the Satan of rabbinism. Of course they may need an outline of that kind, and for their purposes it may be necessary to prepare such an outline. I for one, cannot use any manual which is not written by myself, and I say also, that you are perfectly justified in rejecting the manual I might write. I have my own idiosyncrasies, my own pedagogical methods. I have my own view-points. I cannot give view-points to my own pupils that are not my own. You are just as well justified in refusing to abide by my judgment. If you succeed in creating an outline, that may be of any help to any one, I will be the first to welcome it. At the same time you may charge it to my rather overburdened

account of sins against the Conference, if you learn that I do not use this manual in my own instruction.

Rabbi Harris—It seems to me that this discussion might help to instruct the committee on the kind of outline it would be well to formulate. What Dr. Hirsch says is the sense of the matter: we necessarily impose some of our individuality upon the lessons we impart. If this manual had a complete confirmation service, it would not be wise. But if this manual gathers the kind of information all rabbis would naturally wish to give to their pupils, information in regard to ceremonials, in regard to customs, in regard to doctrine, and is enriched by Scriptural quotations, there you offer, not a manual through which they must pass completely, but one from which they may select, leaving individuality enough to satisfy even Dr. Hirsch.

A Rabbi—Is the manual to be prepared by the Committee?

Rabbi Gries—The resolution says that the Committee have prepared and submitted to the next Conference, an outline of lessons for confirmation classes. The committee that will be appointed, will be a committee representative of the Conference; no doubt they will write to the members of the Conference for suggestions as to what the manual should contain.

Rabbi Schulman—This is a much more important matter than some may think. When you once shall have appointed a committee that shall prepare a list of the chief points that every confirmation class ought to be taught by the rabbi, then you have practically formulated for American Judaism that which you consider is the Judaism that the Conference stands for, with respect to the presentation of doctrines and other things. I do not say that I cannot conceive of the possibility of the Conference doing such a thing, yet this is not such a simple matter as it seems. The Conference ought to think very seriously, before it commits itself. There are a number of text-books on religion and ethics; these text-books are being supplemented by the rabbis themselves. I, myself, teach by dictation to the children. But as soon as you publish such a report, then you practically put every rabbi on the defensive, in respect

to this report, if he is not inclined towards the manual. I therefore urge you to give this matter more consideration.

Rabbi Berkowitz—It seems to me, that the report of the Committee has gone a little too far. What we need, is a program for the next Conference on the general question of material for confirmation classes. After we have thrashed that out in Conference, then we could formulate it in a pamphlet. To begin with the pamphlet, would be the wrong method. I amend this recommendation, to read that at the next Conference, Religious School Day be devoted to a consideration of special work in confirmation classes.

The amendment was seconded and carried.

The third recommendation was adopted.

The fourth recommendation was read.

Rabbi Schlesinger—This suggestion implies that there is a uniformity in our schools. But there is no such uniformity.

Rabbi Hirsch—I do not think it necessary that we issue such a card. A child comes to me from another city and states to me, "I have been an attendant of such a school, I am such an age, and have passed through such and such studies:" I know where the child belongs. My school is free. We have millionaires' children in our school, who do not pay, and we have others that are fortunate enough not to be millionaires' children. Both are welcome. Suppose a card says the child comes from the seventh grade; I do not know what that means, if it comes from another school. Therefore, I do not see the use of the card.

Rabbi Kornfeld—It is simply to help in putting the child in the proper class.

Rabbi Gries—I want to explain how I think a card should be used. We have many children come from other cities to Cleveland; when the child comes it brings a report, that it used to go to a certain school of a certain rabbi of a certain city. It does not know how many years it has been going or what work it has done. I have to write to the rabbi and ask how many years the child has been in the school and what work the child

has covered. Furthermore, the card encourages the child moving into a new city, to go immediately to the Sabbath School. As far as the grades of the school are concerned the committee knows there is no uniformity in our schools, therefore it specifies the work done; the superintendent can determine the grade of the child.

The amendment was lost.

The recommendation of the committee was carried.

The fifth recommendation was read.

Rabbi Foster—I wish to ask for this information; Is this work to be done by this body exclusively, or in connection with the United States Government or some other institution?

Rabbi Gries—The resolution says that both the plan and the necessary expenditure be submitted to and approved by the Executive Committee. This is a program of work for years to come. You cannot do all this work in one year, but you have to make a beginning some time. As far as the plan is concerned, the United States Government has done that work already in part, and their information is available to us. The plan of the Executive Committee will, no doubt, include that.

Rabbi Landman—The matter does not seem so very difficult. On the first canvas we made in Philadelphia, we received three-fourths replies, and after the third canvas, we had every child of our congregation from three to sixteen years old.

Rabbi Gries—I have with me the report of the census we made in Cleveland during the last three years, showing how many children are in the public schools, and how many in the Sabbath Schools.

The fifth recommendation was adopted.

The sixth recommendation was adopted.

The seventh recommendation was read.

Rabbi Deutsch—I would suggest that it might be well to have a series of stereopticon views. It is a good way of teaching important facts in history.

The suggestion was accepted by the committee.

Rabbi Harris—There would be opportunity of schools exchanging these slides without separate purchases.

The seventh recommendation was adopted.

The eighth recommendation was adopted by a rising vote.

Rabbi Landau—I want to speak in reference to the last subject mentioned in the report—training schools for teachers. It seems to me that our chief lack in education is text-books, and, moreover, the more technical training of Jewish teachers. I do not mean simply for the large congregations, but the congregations in the country generally. I have a plan, which, if thought feasible by the Conference, will be of value to the country at large. I have a son seventeen years of age, who has just taken up a course in advertising. Although he has not yet completed the course, he has been appointed manager advertiser to one of the largest concerns in Philadelphia. He has taken up this course through the medium of the International Correspondence School. I mention the fact that he has been promoted to this position, as showing the feasibility of being taught by correspondence. Thousands have been taught technical subjects in that way. I have a pamphlet in my hands from which I learn that thousands of people in this country are taught the entire curriculum of teaching by means of correspondence. Perhaps the Conference might be able to do for the smaller congregation, what this International School is doing for its pupils. What is the condition of things? We are able to get normal school teachers, public school teachers, for the large schools. We are going to enlarge our possibilities of instruction through the kindly generosity of Mr. Jacob Schiff. What about the smaller communities? You know there are many small communities in which there are no synagogues or schools. There are other congregations in the embryo, in which there is something of the feeling of Judaism. We have places that get up a scratch team of teachers who want to teach. I think we can help them through correspondence. I have asked about the correspondence school and have been told, that if we send a man there he can learn their method. They assure me one person, when

the organization has been effected, can be instrumental in teaching hundreds of pupils. If you find this plan feasible, the Conference will leave its impress on all the congregations of the land. I would suggest the appointment of a committee, which shall consider this matter in all its details and report at the next meeting of the Conference. I move that this be referred to the incoming Committee on Religious Education.

The motion was duly seconded and carried.

The report as a whole was adopted.

Rabbi Gries as chairman of the Committee on Religious Schools, in charge of the library portion of the program of Religious School Day, took the chair.

Rabbi Louis Grossman read his paper on, "The Province of the Sabbath School." (cf. Appendix e.)

Rabbi Krass presented his "Review of Text-Books for Ethics." (cf. Appendix f.)

The discussion was led by Rabbi Berkowitz. (cf. Appendix f, close.)

Rabbi Kaplan—One excellent book was omitted in the review, viz., "Religion, in Seven Parts," by Rabbi J. Leonard Levy. It is related to this work and I believe, should be mentioned in this report.

Rabbi Harris—Ethics is not a subject to be taught in the Sunday School. We confuse ethics with conduct. Ethics is a department of philosophy. Spinoza called his philosophy ethics. Sunday School teachers should have courses in ethics, just as in psychology, but they should not teach psychology to the children; they should use their psychology in the teaching.

Rabbi Schulman—Unless you are going to teach morality scientifically only, the only way is by the inductive method, by a live teacher, and the strong personality of the teacher. In teaching Bible history, the subject matter should be presented as a present fusion of ethics, morality and religion. Criticizing Rabbi Greenstone's work, Rabbi Krass turned away with the remark, that dietary laws help us to be temperate, and that is very true, they do help us to be temperate.

Rabbi Landau—I quite recognize that this review of text-books may be of considerable use. There may also be a danger. I want to say that I, personally, am not in agreement with the conclusion of the critic as to one book, "Israel's Faith." I think that is an eminently fine contribution to this subject. Moreover, I strongly resent a remark made by Dr. Krass, in which he endeavors to show a difference between ethics from the orthodox and reform standpoint. He said we have not a book that formulates ethics from the reform standpoint. I draw the inference that there is a difference in the ethics as considered by Orthodoxy and Reform—that I deny; they are the same.

Rabbi Deutsch—An abstract of ethical statements from Jewish literature, beginning with the Bible and coming down to the latest times, would be a meritorious undertaking. We want to strengthen the Jewish consciousness from the Bible. To illustrate my idea, there is the Bible statement, "You shall not sleep when a poor man has a claim against you," and that from the Talmud, "You shall give to poor Jews and non-Jews alike." It is a matter, I think, of importance.

Rabbi Raisin—I think the text book has a definite purpose. There are some faults to be found, but as a whole, I do not think that we should censure a man for having written a book simply because it does not come up to our expectations.

Rabbi Ehrenreich—I regard Rabbi Krass's criticism as too severe. Every one of the writers was a graduate of our schools. They were forming books for the guiding of men in the smaller communities. Every one of the books reviewed has some merits. It is for the rabbi to use the book as a guide, and that is the purpose of the books reviewed this morning.

Rabbi Krass—I wish to say by way of explanation, that I did not want to define the faults exclusively of these books. Remember the subject assigned me, was text-books of Jewish ethics, not of Jewish religion. Most of the books were on religion; the ethics were the smallest portion. Where the emphasis is on the dietary laws and the resurrection of the dead, it is not our Reform point of view, and such a book is not suited

for our Sunday Schools. One more point; when I alluded to those text-books, the viewpoint of which is orthodox, I had in consideration not the moral portions but the other portions, on which as much emphasis has been laid as on the ethical portion. Only twenty pages of Greenstone's book is devoted to Jewish ethics, while the remainder is devoted to Jewish religion.

Rabbi Kornfeld presented his "Review of Biblical Histories." (cf. Appendix g.)

The discussion was led by Rabbi Franklin. (cf. Appendix g, close.)

The President then resumed the chair. Rabbi Gries made the following statement, preparatory to his report on the Religious School Exhibit.

Rabbi Gries—I wish to say to the members of the Conference, that I, myself, am very much disappointed in the exhibit, although there is much to interest you. I very much regret that we have not as complete an exhibit as I hope we will have at another Conference. I thank Miss Rich for the arrangement of the books and the hanging of the pictures. There are pictures for wall decoration, and also small pictures to be used in two ways, one, to be put in the hands of the children, one, to group all the prints that cover the same period. You will find among the exhibits that of American histories. They are put there for a purpose. The American history, put in the hands of the public school child, is an attractive book and finely printed and very cheap. I put it there for a contrast, to show what the child gets in the public school and what we give to our children for Bible history. We have also some Y. M. C. A. books; they have published some splendid books, especially for men's classes. We have nothing of the sort. You will find a certain group of books of which this is a copy. I have in my hand here three books, one a list published by the Sunday School Commission of the Episcopal Church. The purpose of this book is to tell you where to get a thing and what to get. It covers all the supplies of interest to a Sunday School. This little book called the "Sunday School Advance," is a catalogue

that gives you in the best possible way all the books, pictures, maps and everything else. There is a good deal in this book that you do not want. At the same time it tells you what you do want. I have here a hundred copies belonging to the Conference, and to be sold at five cents each, less than cost, and given by the courtesy of the publisher, Franklin D. Elmer. One more book, a selected list published by the "Religious Education Association"; if you write to Chicago, they will send you that list gratis.

Rabbi Gries then presented the report on Religious School Exhibit. On motion, this was received and ordered taken up seriatim, as the first business of the afternoon.

THE RELIGIOUS SCHOOL EXHIBIT.

To the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

The Committee on Religious Schools recommends:

1st. That the Conference establish a permanent Religious School exhibit, to consist of books, maps, pictures, lantern slides, stereographs, teachers' helps, lesson helps, school devices, material illustrative of the manual method, ceremonial objects and *all* materials which may be of value for the rabbi, teacher and pupil, covering the field of the Old Testament, Jewish life and Jewish history.

2d. That this Religious School exhibit shall be upon display annually during the sessions of the Conference and during the year at such places and under such conditions as the Executive Committee may direct; also that it be the sense of the Conference that the exhibit may be loaned to Religious School Associations, and perhaps to individual schools, as the Executive Committee may determine, and in accordance with plans to be approved by them.

3d. That the Central Conference of American Rabbis express its appreciation to the publishers of Religious School material, who, by their cordial goodwill, their hearty co-operation and their generous contributions towards a permanent exhibit, have made possible the success of our exhibit.

It is respectfully suggested that a real appreciation of the members of the Conference will be best shown by the examination and study of the exhibit and by individual purchases of books and other material which may seem of value.

4th. That the annual exhibit may include an exhibit from individual schools, showing the methods and special plans in use; also work done, especially according to the manual method; also the reports, forms,

blanks, etc. In order to give information to all concerning the ideas and methods and work, which may be new and of value, the earnest co-operation of all rabbis is most respectfully urged. Without it this individual school exhibit cannot succeed.

5th. That it is important to include in the exhibit the important new books of interest to rabbis, though not dealing specially with the problems of the Religious School.

It is the main purpose of the exhibit that rabbis and teachers may see and know the text-books and the material available for Religious School work, and that we may be stimulated to the development of new and necessary material. Also that we may demonstrate the new methods being applied in our Religious Schools.

Respectfully submitted,

MOSES J. GRIES,

Chairman.

The following resolution was presented.

Resolved, That it is the sense of this Conference that a rabbi ought not to officiate at a marriage between a Jew or Jewess and a person professing a religion other than Judaism, inasmuch as such mixed marriage is prohibited by the Jewish religion, and would tend to disintegrate the religion of Israel. (Signed) SAMUEL SCHULMAN, WILLIAM ROSENAU."

Rabbi Silverman—I move that the resolution be tabled. Seconded.

The motion to table the resolution was lost.

Rabbi Stolz—I move that this resolution be referred to the Resolution Committee. Seconded and carried.

The Conference adjourned.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, NOVEMBER 12, 1909.

The meeting was resumed at 2:30 o'clock.

The first recommendation of the report on Sabbath School Exhibit, was read.

Rabbi Gries—I do not know whether the members of the Conference appreciate how much labor is involved in the exhibit. I do, because I have tried my hand at it a couple of times on a small scale. This time it has required two months of correspondence. It is hard work. It means attention to this par-

ticular thing. Therefore, it is well to determine whether you really wish it, for it is a foolish waste of time to have it, if you do not really believe it is worth while. I would not want to do the work, unless it is worth while. I think there ought to be a perfectly frank expression of opinion on this subject.

Rabbi Kornfeld—It would not be a bad idea to have these books and articles, listed, so that the members of the Conference who examine the books, might see what they are.

Rabbi Gries—I intend to suggest that we make a list after we examine the exhibit. Every one of those things you have seen, is in this book, which you can buy for five cents. If we have a permanent exhibit we should have a list so that every one could tell what the exhibit is.

The Chair—You must understand that this involves a certain expense; if you want the exhibit it will cost money. Rabbi Gries is perfectly willing to do the work; he is able to do it; but he wants to know whether you actually want the exhibit.

The first recommendation was adopted.

The second recommendation was read.

Rabbi Gries—The question is, where shall the exhibit be kept. The opinion of the Chairman is, it should be kept at the Hebrew Union College, and be loaned to State Associations and individual schools as shall be determined upon.

The second recommendation was adopted.

The third recommendation was read.

Rabbi Gries—Some publishers said, that if we wanted a permanent exhibit, they would give us their books. Others will sell us their books at 50 percent discount. Their spirit has been very fine. All are willing to lend and pay their own expenses, and some are willing to give.

The Chair—The Secretary of the Conference will write an individual letter of acknowledgement to the publishers who have been especially nice about this, if the Chairman of the Committee will give him the names.

The third recommendation was adopted.

The fourth recommendation was read.

Rabbi Schlesinger—What is the manual work of a religious school?

Rabbi Gries—Quite a number of the rabbis have lessons in which there is an outline map and the children fill it in. In some classes they make models in teaching the construction of the Temple. They make a model, for instance, of the seven branched candlestick. The models and maps are made of paper mache. A boy of fourteen will make a map, and after he has made one, he knows where the mountains and rivers are.

The fourth recommendation was adopted.

The fifth recommendation was read.

Rabbi Kohler—This says religious books older than manual work. Will there be books treating of all the ceremonials, for the information of the Sabbath School pupils, and all kinds of archaeological books? It won't hurt any of us or any of our children if they know from an exhibit, how a mezuzah is opened and closed. I think we ought to be proud of the exhibit.

Rabbi Gries—In the opening paragraph we specify a great deal, and at the end say "all material which may have to do with Jewish life." It is merely a question of how far we can go, what money we may spend.

Rabbi Mayer—How would the books be purchased?

Rabbi Gries—We would not purchase the books; the publishers would send them here. You hear about a book, then when you take the book in hand and run through the index, you will know whether you want it. That is what I want to give you an opportunity to do.

The fifth recommendation was adopted.

Rabbi Gries—I might say, in reference to what Dr. Kohler asked me a moment ago, that if any one does not know about the exhibit in the Smithsonian Institute, they will send a report free, with illustrations in the book. It is a very good thing, the best of its kind I know of.

The report as a whole was adopted.

On motion, a vote of thanks was extended to the Chairman

of the Committee on Religious Schools for his labors in establishing the exhibit.

Rabbi Gries took the chair, and the literary portion of the program of the day was resumed.

Rabbi Solomon presented his "Review of Courses of Study in Jewish Schools." (cf. Appendix *h*.)

Rabbi Gries—There is a recommendation contained in the paper, which, I suppose, should be referred to some later meeting of the Conference; if there is no objection we will follow that order.

After discussion the recommendations contained in the report, were referred to the Committee on Religious Schools, with power to act.

Rabbi Gries—The discussion is now open.

Rabbi Kohler—I want to ask a question; is one a better Jew, if he believes in the Bible as such, or if he does not believe in the Bible as such? I do not believe in the Bible as such. What does "as such" mean? "As such" means the Bible in its letter as it stands. We are not Christians. The Christian stands on the letter of the Bible; the Jew stands on the interpretation of the Bible, and that is tradition. Those who say the Bible is the text-book of Judaism, do not understand Judaism. I want to be recorded on this point. It is a misunderstanding, thoroughly, of the whole import of the spirit of Judaism to say that the Bible is our text-book. How will, upon the basis of the Bible as a text-book, Shabuoth, the festival of the giving of the Torah, be explained? Furthermore, Rosh Hashana, exists in the Bible only as the new moon, not in any way as the New Year. And also, how about the Deuteronomic law, which says—Thou shalt not let one soul (of the Canaanites) live,—and all that is connected therewith? Brethren, let us not deceive ourselves. We are not Bibliolaters nor Karaites. Those who want to tell us that the text-books are worthless, and that the Bible is the thing, do not understand Judaism.

Rabbi Elkin—As I understand the use of the Bible for the instruction of our children, this premises that the rabbi or the

teacher, who is teaching out of the Bible, should know the tradition, because the child taught mere traditional Judaism, would not understand us. We must take the Bible as a text-book. It is presumed the rabbi should know what he is teaching, he himself being grounded in the traditions.

Rabbi Kornfield—The critic combines two different books in order to bring out the same story, which has two diametrical tendencies. The book of Chronicles has an entirely different spiritual tendency from the Book of Kings. He gives the older book of Samuel, which is historical, and gives the part Samuel plays. It is high time for us to be honest with the children in our attitude towards Bible criticism. If we do not believe in those things it is not the same, for we do not care to put ourselves on record, because we wish to avoid schism. With the children we must be honest; as there are two different tendencies they must be brought out.

Rabbi Moses—I wish to add to, and at the same time correct, the impression Dr. Kohler made here, with his criticism on the use of the Bible as a matter of belief. I have had the same experiences with the text-book, as my brother and myself produced a book on the Bible, omitting those sentences which were not readable. The teachers preferred other text-books. I have had a few teachers who have preferred to use the Bible. I have had the same conscientious scruples about introducing the Bible as Dr. Kohler said, still we should have reverence for the word of God. What do we mean by the word of God? It is contained in the Bible. For me, the whole Bible is the Word of God, the Psalms and everything. Let it not go forth that here it was said the Bible is not our text-book, that we cannot place it in the hands of the children. I do feel that the Bible as a whole is the Word of God.

Rabbi Ehrenreich—I am one who is a graduate of the Jewish Theological Seminary. I am, however, as very many of you know, not an orthodox Jew. At the same time, I am not an ultra. I have been trying to delve into the secrets and mysteries of Reform Judaism as understood by the Conference, but have been

unable to fathom them so far. I am astounded that the President of the Hebrew Union College should make the statement, that the Bible is not the Word of God, and that we can not teach it as such, cannot teach it as the basis of Judaism. We have been told that the Talmud is not, and the Midrash is not. What is? What are we to use as basis for the instruction of our children?

Rabbi Philipson—This is the first word I have spoken from the floor. I do so, only in order to throw what I hope will be oil upon the troubled waters. I do not believe that you understood what Dr. Kohler meant. What Dr. Kohler meant, I believe, is this: not only the Bible, but everything that has been brought forth by the spirit of Jewish tradition is our Torah.

Rabbi Kohler—That is it.

Rabbi Philipson—His expression was unfortunate possibly, but this is what was meant. And since this is an experience meeting, I may simply state, that in my own school, we try to do that; we combine with the Bible instruction, the instruction from the Talmud and Midrash, and the whole trend of the Jewish spirit through the ages.

Rabbi Schulman—It is an unfortunate thing that what Dr. Kohler said has been misunderstood. We are not Karaites nor Bibliolaters. The genuine Jew is influenced by his traditions.

Rabbi Solomon—My idea in speaking about Biblical histories, etc., was, that what we want to do in the Sunday School, is to try to bring the children to the Bible, and not take them from it. Now I also feel that there was absolutely no occasion for the statement of the President of Union College on this subject of the Bible. If he or anybody else, would have examined the series of lessons I prepared for the teachers, he would have seen that it was not the word of the Bible, but the whole tradition of Judaism, up to the time where Talmudic history begins, that was outlined. I did say it should be arranged in whatever chronological order we wished. We can take Kings and Chron-

icles and put them together—it is not an easy task, but it is a possible one.

The meeting adjourned.

FRIDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 12, 1909.

The Conference service was held in Temple Emanu-El. After the regular service for Sabbath Eve from the Union Prayer Book, a passage from the Bible was read by Rabbi J. Leon Magnes, after which the Conference Sermon was preached by Rabbi H. G. Enelow. (cf. Appendix i.) The memorial address on Samuel Adler, in honor of the one hundredth anniversary of his birth, was delivered by Rabbi Joseph Silverman. (cf. Appendix j.) The services were concluded with prayer and benediction by Rabbi W. S. Friedman.

SATURDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 13, 1909.

On Sabbath morning the pulpits of congregations in Greater New York and vicinity were occupied by members of the Conference as follows:

Agudath Yescharim (113 E. 86th St.)	.. Rabbi Wm. H. Greenburg
Anshe Chesed	Rabbi David Lefkowitz
Ahavath Chesed Shaar Hashomayim...	Rabbi Adolph Guttmacher
Bene Yeshurum	Rabbi Henry Cohen
Beth El	Rabbi Kaufman Kohler
Beth Israel Bikur Cholin	Rabbi George Zepin
Emanu-El.....	Rabbi Joseph Stolz
Hand in Hand	Rabbi Ephraim Frisch
Rodeph Shalom	Rabbi Louis Grossman
Temple Israel of Harlem	Rabbi Abram Simon
West End Synagogue	Rabbi M. Friedlander

Brooklyn.

Beth Elohim (Keap St.)	Rabbi Tobias Schanfarber
Beth Elohim (State St.)	Rabbi Nathan Krass

Israel Rabbi Emanuel Kahn
Newark.

B'nai Jeshurun Rabbi Morris Newfield

SUNDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 14, 1909.

On Sunday morning the following pulpits were occupied by members of the Conference:

Beth El Rabbi David Philipson
Emanu-El..... Rabbi Louis Wolsey

	{ Rabbi Leo. M. Franklin
The Free Synagogue	{ Rabbi Wm. S. Friedman
	{ Rabbi Moses J. Gries

MONDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 15, 1909.

On Monday morning a visit was paid to the Government Immigration Station at Ellis Island, where, through the courtesy of Hon. William Williams, an opportunity was given the members of the Conference to observe the Immigration Office in operation.

MONDAY AFTERNOON.

The meeting was opened with prayer by Rabbi Simon R. Cohen. The minutes of Friday's sessions were read and approved.

The report of the Committee on Social and Religious Union was presented by its Chairman, Rabbi Louis Wolsey.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS UNION.

To the Officers and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

BRETHREN: Your Committee on Social and Religious Union, to which was entrusted the task of making further inquiry and gathering statistics in the matter of institutional work in our various congregations, adopted the same plan that has been in use by this Committee for the last three years, namely, the sending out of questionnaires to our colleagues. We sent out 164 of these questionnaires, to which was attached an appeal for an answer. It is sometimes necessary to appeal for a reply,

and the appeal brought forth results. Out of the 164 questionnaires 97 were answered, a figure which represents, if not greater activity in our congregations, at least an awakening to the fact that there may be an epistolary etiquette even in our Conference. We were favored with 57 replies last year. Nearly sixty percent answered this year, as over against less than forty percent for 1908. These 97 answers represent congregations with an aggregate membership of 19,113, or perhaps a total of 76,452 souls, figures which we cite merely to indicate the immense possibilities of social religious activity in American Judaism. Our own Conference, in acting as a sort of clearance house for statistics, might also be regarded as a centralizing and unifying agency in the religious socialization of a very considerable Jewish population.

Only seven of our colleagues report Men's Clubs in their congregations, which clubs are quite various in their activities. They are literary or philanthropic or social. One has papers and discussions on Jewish topics, another conducts organ recitals, a third entertains some noted guest once a month, while still another conducts a lecture course or confines its activity to charitable purposes. It is a matter of more than passing interest for us to note that there are so few Men's Clubs in our congregations. When we consider that 67 of our colleagues report that they have at least one women's organization, while most of the remainder have a section of the Council of Jewish Women, we are very strongly reminded of the fact that in Reform Judaism the synagogue has been very much feminized. The situation suggests a subject for a paper for next year's Conference. What is responsible for the condition? Is the responsibility to be found in Reform Judaism itself, or in the modern life with which Reform was meant to deal, or with social conditions, or with modern religious life?

The women's societies very largely concern themselves with the needs of the Temple. They raise money for carpets and furniture; they pay the salaries of the choirs, or they help to pay off the debt of the Temple, or they buy an organ or purchase the decorations. They encourage attendance at services, solicit new members, conduct Sunday-School entertainments and acquaint the members with one another. Many of them are sewing circles for the benefit of the poor, while others are literary in character.

Forty-two report Bible classes, eight of which are Chautauqua circles, and four of which are conducted by the Council of Jewish Women. One of these classes is composed of students from the local university. One has a course in the Christology of the Old Testament, a feature which is recommended for the use of those who could succeed in forming a Bible class if the stimulus of novelty were added to its study. One of these classes is for young men, three for Sunday-School teachers and seven for post-confirmands. In few cases has there been any notation as to how

much interest is shown, and where there is answer to the question, it is to say that the classes are either small or that interest is not great. We strongly suspect that the majority of these Bible classes lead a rather precarious existence. We are led to observe that, where the synagogue has become exclusively a house of worship, it has lost much. We believe that, if we could again introduce the school house into the Temple, we would not complain quite so frequently of empty pews.

An interesting phase of our congregational life is the solicitude being actively evidenced by our colleagues for the religious welfare of the adolescent. 80 report some organization for the young people. 19 of these organizations are specifically post-confirmation classes or clubs, some under the name of Temple Alumni. They study Jewish and secular literature, Jewish history, Jewish Customs and Ceremonials, or they are organized into glee and choral societies, or athletic clubs, or they give entertainments the revenues of which are devoted to charity, or they do some dramatic work, or they are sometimes play-clubs, either for social or philanthropic purposes.

Thirty-nine report Junior or Children's Choirs, that sing either in the Religious School or at the Sabbath morning services, or on special occasions, as, for example, on Shabuoth. One has a children's orchestra. One hopes to graduate his young people's choir into the regular choir for Sabbath services. Perhaps the day is not far off when Jewish melodies will be sung by Jewish voices in the synagogue.

We are surprised to note that there are still some of our congregations without any library. 71 answer that their synagogues are so equipped, and four report that they are planning a library. A few are equipped with a stereopticon, with Biblical pictures that are very useful on all occasions. Perhaps it might be wise for our colleagues living in cities where there are public libraries to persuade their congregations to install a Jewish corner in those libraries.

Lecture courses seem to be growing in popularity, for 32 report such activity under the auspices of the congregation, or of one of its societies, while six had lectures occasionally, and five more are planning courses for this year. Only eight reported any such activity last year.

At a time when the immigrant looms large upon the American Jewish horizon it is interesting to note that our congregations are busying themselves with his education and Americanization. Eleven report night classes for the teaching of English and American citizenship, six conduct a settlement, two aim to provide the immigrant with work, three have established a kindergarten for his children, and in Galveston the local congregation has an immigration bureau for the purpose of distributing our new citizens throughout the South and West. In most cases this work is done by independent organizations, but our colleagues report that they are personally active in such work. Our colleagues in Seattle, Selma,

Salt Lake, Oakland, Evansville, Jacksonville and Pensacola, Fla., report that there is "no need" of any such activity in their communities. This information might be communicated to our various removal offices. The suggestion is offered as a help towards solving our problem of congestion. One of our colleagues reports that he has organized a congregation and a charitable society among the immigrants, another conducts Friday evening services in their neighborhood, while still another is in charge of a local branch of the Industrial Removal Office.

In addition to all the above activities we have reported to us such organizations as a Temple Club of boys of the Sunday-School, a Sunday-School Normal, Sisterhoods of Personal Service, a Young Women's Guild that maintains a ward at a local hospital, a society composed of soldiers stationed at local forts, a Free Daily Kindergarten, a Talmud Torah, a Board of Ushers composed of the young men, an Acquaintance Committee that calls on new members and strangers and introduces them to the older members at various gatherings, Cemetery Associations and classes at gymnasiums.

A significant fact of modern Jewish religious life is the transference of the Seder celebration from the home to the synagogue. This is true of much of the religious life of the modern Jew—the answers to our questionnaire force us to that conclusion, whether it is to our liking or not. 29

Pesach.

colleagues report that they have a congregational Seder. Four of these Seders were held on the second night of Pesach. In addition to this, 19 have the Seder celebrated by the entire Sunday-School, to some of which the parents are invited, and most all say that great interest is manifested in these congregational celebrations. A few answers report the congregational Seder with an apology, for they say that this innovation is merely intended to show the members how to celebrate the first evening of the Passover in the home.

Many devote the three or four weeks preceding the Passover to pulpit and personal appeals to celebrate the Seder, some adding to these appeals a public rehearsal of the ceremonies, one such rehearsal having as many as one thousand people present. Some urge the people to purchase Haggadas, and a few distribute them among their members. Three report that they have the confirmation class at their home the first night of Passover.

One encourages the Passover sentiment by lectures on Jewish ceremonials, another talks to the children with the aid of lantern slides, and a third has the choir sing Handel's oratorio, "Israel in Egypt."

Our answers to the question, "What means do you employ to interest

the people in the observance of Sukkoth?" lead to the same conclusion

Sukkoth.

which we have arrived at in our review of the statistics with reference to the Passover. 53 report the erection of a Sukkah either in the Temple, or in the vestry rooms, or adjacent to the Temple. In the Sukkah the people gather, say the Kiddush blessing and the Motzi. Whatever be our views on this matter of the Temple Sukkah, the verdict is inevitable that renewed interest in the holiday is nearly everywhere manifest. Perhaps there have been many innovations, perhaps there has been a change of method and manner, but the new has unquestionably been built upon the foundations of the old. Some have a children's harvest service, and distribute the fruits which the children offer upon the altar to the various local institutions of charity. Many decorate the pulpit with fruits and flowers, others have a service of song, and some even use the day to have the children present gifts to one another. One devotes Simchath Torah to a congregational social. In Philadelphia a pilgrimage is made to the Farm School.

Ten give a dance for the children on Purim; two celebrate the day with a social gathering; sixty-nine have a children's entertainment,

Purim.

either with a Purim play or living pictures of the Esther story, or stereopticon views, or various recitations and other exercises. One has a congregational banquet on this day. Two encourage the children to have masking parties and collect money for some Temple project. In most cases the old idea of *sh'lachmonos* is still observed.

This holiday is still celebrated by nearly everyone with some exercises for the children. The candles are lighted, not alone in the Temple,

Chanukkah.

but also in the home. In many cases the candles and a cheap candelabra are distributed to the children. One has a children's party, many have a play, some have living pictures of either Maccabean or Biblical characters, and one celebrates the opening evening with a rendition of Handel's oratorio, "Judas Maccabæus."

But all the work of the synagog is not done within the walls of the Temple. Many are interested in civic matters: some conduct the local Jewish charities, others either contribute to the salary of, or provide, a Jewish chaplain for the local prisons or the local United States forts. One congregation supports two beds at a children's free hospital, one establishes an industrial school, several have religious schools in the congested districts, and some provide for Jewish religious instruction in the local deaf and dumb asylums. An interesting custom of one colleague is the welcoming of the unaffiliated to the Temple, who is solicited for membership, introduced to the congregation, and whose name is read out from the pulpit and given a blessing, together with a reminder of a

member's duty. In most congregations the stranger and the unaffiliated are welcomed to the Temple, and free seats provided for them. Some send out printed invitations, particularly to the traveling salesmen who happen to be stopping at the local hotels. This work is usually done by the young people, who look over the hotel registers, find out the names that appear to be Jewish, and leave cards in their mail boxes. In one case those cards contain an announcement of the sermon subject for the following Sabbath evening.

Besides the organizations already mentioned, the young people are interested in the congregation by being entrusted with the work of ushering, or with the conduct of Sabbath-School services, or with the work of teaching in the Sabbath-School. Three conduct special Yom Kippur services for the young people between the hours of 2 and 3:30 o'clock.

The suggestion made by this Committee three years ago, that our colleagues aim to have occasional meetings of the congregation either at the banquet table or at socials, has been bearing fruit. Some have such meetings as often as every month. One gives it the character of a family reunion. At these meetings religious conditions are discussed, or some topic of current interest considered. In this manner the members of the congregation become acquainted with one another, and some feel that this is an agency which combats quite successfully the formation of factions.

The attitude of most of our answers is favorable to these institutions and innovations in congregational life. Many of our colleagues do not venture an answer to this question at all. The

The Effect.

majority feels that all these celebrations and institutional creations have helped to deepen the interest of the members in the synagogue and in each other, that they have heightened interest in Jewish matters generally, that they have helped to make the Temple a center for Jewish communal life, that they unite parent and child in worship, that they religionize social functions, that they stimulate the Jewish consciousness, that they prevent disintegration, and that they at least serve to keep the congregation alive. In the last instance we fear that they do not justify themselves, for if the innovation is introduced to create a spirit, rather than express a spirit that is already there, then the innovation is but a novelty or a grateful diversion that must perish. These institutions must be used merely as an outlet for the social and religious consciousness. Give our people an opportunity to express their latent Jewish consciousness, and that consciousness will be stimulated and developed. But create a class, a club, a Seder, in order to be able to show in the newspaper or your weekly or annual bulletin "What we have done," and the vitality of the religious life of your congregation will be proportionate to the duration of their interest in a novelty.

One aspect of this review must here be noted. We have already alluded to the fact that much of our religious activity is confined to the synagog. This constrains one of our colleagues to remark that these institutions are only a substitute, and that they "tend to transfer 'home life' to 'synagog life.'" He errs if he thinks that that is either their purpose or tendency. The synagog has risen in importance because the home was first de-religionized and de-Judaized. But we must also remember that the education of the child is today chiefly in the hands of the schoolmaster, and hence all the greater is the demand made upon that teacher for more scientific preparation. The synagog is the victim of circumstances. It is compelled to do what the home either refuses or neglects to do.

Recognizing, therefore, the necessity of all these activities in our synagogal life, this Committee recommends to the Conference:

1st. That the Committee on Social and Religious Union be empowered to gather more statistics upon this subject.

2d. That it be authorized to make a reprint of this report, to be distributed among the officers and workers of our congregations for the purpose of encouraging the formation of clubs, classes, societies, gatherings and the institution of entertainments and celebrations of a religious and Jewish character.

3d. That this Committee be charged with the duty of collecting data with reference to the various confirmation exercises for the use of our members.

4th. That this Committee publish from time to time a bulletin indicating the organizations and innovations which our congregations are introducing.

Respectfully submitted,

LOUIS WOLSEY, *Chairman*,
EMIL W. LEIPZIGER.

The report was on motion received and taken up seriatim.

The first recommendation was adopted.

The second recommendation was read.

Rabbi Stolz—I would suggest that they use the word "reprint," and that the word "tract" be omitted. Furthermore, the number to be printed should be left to the discretion of the Executive Committee.

Rabbi Raisin—The word "reprint" would not express it. I think if we send a digest of what has been done by the committee it will be better. I move, that a digest of the report be made and distributed by the committee. Seconded.

Rabbi Friedlander—I suggest that the committee discourage the congregational Seder. I have always felt that a Seder held in the synagogue, conducted by the Rabbi and the children, was more of a dramatic performance than an act of worship. I have always felt that the function of Reform Judaism is to eliminate all such performances and ceremonies, that have no application to modern thought and no particular bearing upon the religious and moral life of the modern Jew, and to retain all such ceremonies and practices as do have a bearing upon modern Jewish life, and we should act accordingly. If a Seder is such a ceremony, that to this day it has a religious, and particularly a historical, bearing upon Judaism everywhere, especially upon American Judaism, then we should not cheapen it, by making it a mere dramatic performance. I urge that this committee suggest to our colleagues, the members of the Conference, that they discourage the congregational Seder.

Rabbi Stolz—If the members wish this report to reach the congregations, we should call it a reprint. If we call it a digest, it will have to go to the Finance Committee, and the chances are that they would reject it. I amend to use the word "reprint" instead of "digest." Seconded.

Rabbi Kaplan—My experience has been that long communications are not read; a digest of this report will be much more effective than a reprint of the whole thing.

Rabbi Englander—I feel that the result of sending out this report in general, or even a digest thereof, will commit the rabbi to the carrying out of many of these suggestions, when it may be impossible or inadvisable for him to carry them out at all.

The Chair—I put the amendment of Rabbi Stolz, that the committee make a reprint of the report and send it out to the congregations.

The amendment was carried.

The third recommendation was read.

Rabbi Wolsey—Some of us, perhaps, continue the same program from year to year, just as one preacher, not a rabbi, preached the same sermon every Sunday of the year. We ought

to make our program a little bit elastic, and find out what the others are doing.

Rabbi Moses—I have a few thoughts on this subject, based on experience. I have traveled along the line of program-making for confirmation, from the very point of the beginning, to the point which our colleague here suggests, and I have come to the conclusion, that we will have to go back to the old way we have traveled so far away from. Confirmation exercises have become a show and a farce. At my last confirmation, I became so disgusted with myself, because it was more of a show, more of a declamation than ever, that I determined to henceforth have the children recite various sections of real religious nature, preceded by one or two prayers, not by a confession, but rather by a declaration, and a concluding prayer, and this program shall not vary from year to year. Every child that goes through a confirmation class, shall know that it will not differ from year to year. The prayers become dearer to the different congregations from year to year.

The recommendation was adopted.

The fourth recommendation was read.

Rabbi Morgenstern—The wisdom of this seems questionable. It is the business of the committee each year, to bring in a report, based on its labors during the year. There is no necessity of this committee issuing monthly bulletins; once a year is sufficient. The result of its investigations during the year can be embodied in the report made here, and, if found sufficiently valuable, can be issued separately from year to year.

The fourth recommendation was rejected.

Rabbi Gries—It would be wise to omit the question of appropriation from this general report, and that, before the Executive Committee meets, the Secretary be instructed to ask each committee what its needs will be.

The fifth recommendation was withdrawn.

Rabbi Joseph Leucht—In that report there was something that appealed to me, namely, that the time would come when the Jewish service will be sung by Jewish voices. At present it is not done. Among the questions which the committee sends out,

there ought to be one that has never been there, asking the rabbis, how many Jewish singers they have in their choir. If the answer should come, that there are none at all, then the reason for this should be asked. At present in the city of New York, as I am well informed, no Jewish singer can get any engagement in a Christian church. While that is the custom of many churches, we have allowed the singers of all faiths to sing in our services. I move, that in the future questionnaires that are sent out, this matter should be investigated.

The motion was seconded and carried.

The report as a whole, was then adopted.

The report of the Committee on instruction of Blind, Deaf Mutes, etc., was again taken up. The first recommendation was read and adopted.

The second recommendation was read.

Rabbi Gries—I move that this committee be instructed to confer with the President and Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, in regard to giving religious instruction to young men, who desire to undertake that work.

Rabbi Hirsch—You are trying to fasten on our theological seminaries something they should not be burdened with. The procedure in medical science is this: the man who wants to devote himself to the treatment of defectives, takes a thorough medical course and after that he specializes. So with theology. If there is one who wishes to devote himself to defectives, let him first go through the seminary; then let him go to instructors, who prepare men for the instruction of the defective. A Jewish defective is not particularly differentiated from a non-Jewish defective. If he wants religious instruction, he can get this at the seminary. There is no special theology or religion for a defective. Being connected with the State Board of Charities of Illinois for the last six years, and in almost daily contact with defectives and men who handle defectives, I cannot see what a theological school has to do with the preparation for this defective work. If graduates from the Hebrew Union College feel called to devote themselves to defectives, they can go to other instructors where they can be prepared.

Rabbi Simon—It happens that we had in Washington, a young Jewish man, Samuel Cohen, who had been going to the college at Washington for several years. While taking the University work in Washington, I learned the art of talking with him with the hands. I mapped out Jewish history for him. It was a great nervous strain. He felt called to be a preacher among the deaf mutes. Knowing all about the deaf language, he felt that he, as a deaf mute, could do better among them, than one who was not a deaf mute, one who simply learned something about the science of the language. I inquired of Drs. Kohler and Schechter, if something could not be done for him. He has already had the necessary training in his language; he has had sufficient academic training; what he needs is training at a teachers' college or some theological school, where, in two or three years, he would get sufficient training to do work among the Jewish deaf mutes.

Rabbi Kohler—I would like for the Conference to look at this proposition from that viewpoint from which I am quite certain, the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, whose power and authority are supreme, look upon it, viz., from the financial point of view. In order to have a class of defectives at the college, you must have a professor able to teach defectives. While we all agree that it is highly desirable, I think it is, however, a petition which will not be readily granted by those who have to deal with the financial problems of the school.

Rabbi Simon—I will change it; we recommend that the Conference suggest to the Boards of Governors of the Hebrew Union College and of the Jewish Theological Seminary, the advisability of arranging courses for the rabbinical training of such, as would make work among the deaf mutes their life work.

Rabbi Gries—In England they have those who can do work among the deaf mutes, and we may in time, get such in this country.

The recommendation was adopted.

The third recommendation was adopted.

The fourth recommendation was read.

Rabbi Guttman—I do not see the necessity of appealing to the congregations. If we do anything at all, we ought to appeal to the political bodies of each State, that the State provide chaplains for the Jewish delinquents in their various institutions, as is the case in the State of New York.

Rabbi Hirsch—Maybe the State of New York allows the appointment of sectarian preachers under its law for these institutions; the State of Illinois does not. The State of Illinois employs a non-sectarian chaplain, which is a euphemistic name for Protestant chaplain. In Chicago we have employed a Jewish chaplain. In our State you cannot get it done through the political bodies; it is against the Constitution of the State. I spoke with the Governor about this thing; he said, "There is no fund for a Jewish chaplain; you will get the privilege of having your chaplain recognized; that is as far as we can go."

Rabbi Silverman—In New York State the law provides that the Governor shall appoint a certain number of chaplains, it rests with his discretion whom he shall appoint. Dr. Nathan Stern is appointed by the State of New Jersey.

Rabbi Stern—The supervisors of the prison appointed me.

The fifth recommendation was adopted.

The sixth recommendation was read. Mr. Aaron W. Levy, representing the Federation of Jewish Organizations of the State of New York, was granted the privilege of the floor for ten minutes.

Mr. Levy—I want to say that the Federation of Jewish Organizations of this State, which I have the honor to represent, feels honored at being permitted through its representative to address so distinguished a gathering of the leaders in Israel upon this topic. I, for myself, feel much diffidence indeed, being a layman, in addressing your honorable body upon such a subject. Yet I hope you will indulge me for the few minutes granted to express some thoughts on this subject, which I consider of much importance to Judaism at large.

Without desiring to arouse any antagonism to the particular nomenclature of the Rabbi, we have been used to calling a man

who gives spiritual comfort and consolation to persons in institutions of any kind, a chaplain, so I hope you will permit me to use that name. The question of appointing Jewish chaplains is not a purely Jewish question. On the contrary, the theory is that inasmuch as quite a respectable proportion of the enlisted men in the army and navy are Jews, and as they are now, except in one single instance, without religious training or teaching or advice of any sort, that it is for us as Jews, and particularly, I take the liberty to say, for this Conference of Rabbis, to ask the authorities to appoint at least one or two or more Jewish chaplains, in view of the fact that they now have a great many Catholic and Protestant chaplains. The particular reason for the interest taken in this subject, by the Federation of Jewish Organizations, arises from the fact that it has received several letters from young men, who are in the service of their country, both in the army and navy, complaining that they have not the pleasure of receiving visits from rabbis, while they may be located at places where it is impossible for them to participate in the rites of their faith. I need not say to you, what difficulties and hindrances our boys in the army and navy labor under, by reason of being thrown into very close contact with a very large majority of non-Jews. The authorities have appointed chaplains of the Catholic and Protestant faiths, but there are no Jews. The Jewish boy accordingly, feels that he is set back. He is separated from his communion, and he has no chance of pouring out his soul or giving vent to his thoughts or seeking the spirit of virtue from anybody professing the Jewish faith. If there were a Jewish chaplain, or several of them, there is not the slightest doubt that thousands of our boys in the service of their country, who now conceal the fact that they are Jews, by reason of the great preponderance of the non-Jewish element, would stand out for their faith. It would add greatly to the strength and the dignity and standing of Judaism to have a chaplain who is a real officer of the Government. Merely to be the rabbi of a neighboring congregation would not be enough. It is stated by our informant, that you must have a uniformed, at least a recognized chaplain, so that he may have free entree

to the forts and the other places where soldiers stay, and that he may be invested by the Government with the dignity of his position. A Catholic chaplain, a Protestant chaplain, is permitted to go where he wishes and engage in the games and such things, but the Rabbi must at present stand aside. The Jewish boys ask you to help them, that all Jews help them, to impress on the minds of those in authority, the necessity of giving them some standing, some representation. We all know what burdens our boys must labor under. Let us have a chaplain sent there, who will be recognized as of the Jewish faith. Let the Jewish faith have some standing, that the Jewish boys may not be ashamed, that the Government may recognize the proportion of the Jewish boys in the army and navy. We are wont to boast of the large numbers of boys who enlist in the service of their country, in the time of war. Why should we wait until wars break out, to do good for our boys? Let us, while they are living, and while they are working, in times of peace, get for them the ministry, the Jewish aid that they ask. It seems to me, that this body is peculiarly fitted to handle a problem like this. We ask your co-operation. We think it might be well that a committee of your honorable body, take up this question, or that you, by resolution or some other way, lend us your assistance. The Federation of Jewish Organizations caused to be introduced at the last session of Congress, a bill, which provided for the appointment of more chaplains, avoiding, however, the distinction implied in the term "Jewish" chaplains, but with the clear understanding, that such chaplains to be appointed, would be Jews. Because of the hurry of the passage of the tariff act, this bill had to go by the board. When it comes up at the next Congress, we ask for your support, for something we think every Jew in the country should stand for, and for which he should render his most loyal efforts.

Rabbi Hirsch—We all agree upon this subject. The only question in my minds is, how we can attain the desired end. Are chaplains appointed for the regiment, or are they appointed for districts? If appointed for regiments there is this difficulty.

though the regiment has a certain number of Jewish boys, we have to take this fact into consideration, that the Jewish boy can die and go to heaven without the minister being present, but the Catholic cannot, and probably neither the Protestant. If chaplains are appointed by districts, of course the difficulty can be at once obviated. You do not know that I have the rank of Lieutenant Commander of the naval militia of the State of Illinois. I was appointed during the Cuban War, but only served three days. What they would have done with me, if they had put me on a ship, I do not know. I have had a hand in politics somewhat. If you want to get the thing done by Congress, you have to agitate for it at home. Get your Congressman to feel that you are interested in it, and your congregation is interested. Deluge him with letters. Remind him that election is coming around soon. He will work for you. If you go to Washington, it is doubtful whether you can accomplish anything.

Rabbi Calisch—I move, that it is the sense of this body, that chaplains be appointed for the Jewish soldiers and sailors in the army and navy of the United States. Seconded.

Rabbi Deutsch—By appointment, does it mean that we shall apply to the Federal Government?

Rabbi Calisch—I understand from Mr. Levy's speech, that these chaplains are to be appointed by the Government.

Rabbi Morgenstern—Might it not be well to ask Mr. Levy if he has any practical suggestions to offer? He has laid the matter before us; the body he represents has done work along this line; it is for them to suggest how we can best co-operate with them.

Mr. Levy—I might say that we received a very large number of letters from representatives and Senators at Washington, stating that they were heartily in favor of the project. There is no reason to believe, that there would be any difficulty in the passage of an Act for the appointment of more chaplains, with the understanding, that they shall be Jewish chaplains, if bodies like this, will deluge those Congressmen who have not been reached, or new ones. There is nothing further to say on

the question of the power of the Government to appoint, except that it is left to the executive authority, which has the appointing power.

The Chair—We have not the machinery. Would your organization undertake to transmit a resolution of ours to all Congressman?

Mr. Levy—With very great pleasure.

Rabbi Zepin—I received a communication last winter, asking me if I would accept the position of chaplain of the army and navy. I believe that the whole matter has been settled, and that they are merely looking for a man, or several men, who will undertake the work. However, it will do no harm to pass this resolution.

Mr. Levy—Of course we might wait until there are vacancies, Nevertheless, it may be said of chaplains as of office holders, few die and none resign. Consequently, it was thought advisable that for the present there be an agitation to the effect that more chaplains be appointed, that being the more easy and more polite way out of the difficulty.

Rabbi Deutsch—I think it would be a serious mistake. As a body of Jewish ministers, who are always opposing any combination of State and Church, who are opposing the introduction of the Bible into the public schools, and Christian dogma into the Constitution, you are making a most serious mistake, by adopting a resolution asking Congress to pass a law, giving any Church recognition. Do not let it go on record that the Federal Government, or State governments, or any government, has ever been approached by this body, with a petition to recognize the churches.

Rabbi Wintner—I cannot understand how this idea has been conceived here in our midst. We always pride ourselves on the great American principle of religious and civil liberty. It is the very foundation of our republic, that State and Religion be entirely separate. Are we going now to endorse the idea of appointing these officials in our name, to officiate in the army and navy? I think we do not appreciate what we are doing.

Rabbi Schulman—The theory of Drs. Deutsch and Wintner at first blush, seems correct. It is quite true that this Conference has stood for the separation of Church and State. It is well known that the Government's recognition of religion is simply to extend certain courtesies. When a soldier is dying, he needs the comfort of religion, and the Government simply recognizes that fact, and that it must provide for it. With respect to marriage, the State allows a minister, by courtesy, to perform certain acts of an officer of the State. We therefore, can accept the courtesy. As far as the practical aspect is concerned, if we ask for more chaplains, we simply express our interest as a religious body, in the religious needs of our Jewish soldiers.

Rabbi Enelow—There is one fallacy in the remark of Rabbi Schulman. The State in extending the courtesy to ministers to perform marriages, does not employ them; in the case of a chaplain, we would be asking for an official to be paid by the State.

Rabbi Silverman—I agree with all that has been said in favor of the appointment of chaplains. A few years ago, you may have read in the papers, that an officer of the army claimed that there were no Jewish soldiers in the army and navy, during the Civil War. Simon Wolf was so exasperated by that statement, that he wrote his book, in which he sets down the names of thousands and thousands of Jewish men in the army and navy. After Simon Wolf's book was published, I saw in the public print, a statement over the name of some officer, that Rosenbaum and other similar names were names, not of Jews, but of Germans. Therefore, we should seize every opportunity to have it registered in the annals of our country, that there are a sufficient number of Jews in the army and navy to require chaplains.

Rabbi Calisch—I expected when this resolution was offered, the eagle would scream. I knew that the objection would be made, that we should not lend ourselves to anything smacking of fusion of Church and State. We are not asking for a recognition of the Church. We are simply doing, as Rabbi Schulman has well said, viz., where the State recognizes, not any

particular religion, but recognizes religion in general, as a splendid and desirable factor in the upbuilding of the soldiers and sailors, the defenders of our country, we are asking that chaplains be appointed to carry out this work; and since, furthermore, there are many Jews in the army and navy, we ask that the same privilege extended to other denominations, be likewise extended to us. If we accept the courtesy of the Government like others, it simply emphasizes the fact of our interest in our own Jewish boys. I wonder if any of you ever agitated that his particular synagogue be taxed. I have done so. I was sensible of the fact, that the Church should not have any subvention from the State or from the Federal Government in any way. If those brethren are so particular, there is far more union of Church and State in their not paying taxes, than in this.

Rabbi Hirsch—I move, that the resolution be amended to read as follows: That more chaplains be appointed for the soldiers and sailors of the army and navy of the United States.

Rabbi Simon—I accept the amendment.

Rabbi Solomon—What benefit would it be for a rabbinical Conference to pass such a resolution?

Rabbi Hirsch—Congress is asked to appoint more chaplains without stating of what denomination they shall be; afterwards we shall go to the Secretary of the Navy and say, "These two shall be given to chaplains, who will serve the needs of the Jewish soldiers."

Rabbi Gries—I move to table the resolution. Seconded.

This motion was lost.

The resolution was then put and lost.

The last recommendation of the report was read and adopted.

The report, as amended, was then adopted as a whole.

On the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Reuben Brainin, the eminent Hebrew author, addressed the Conference in Hebrew. Rabbis Deutsch and Hirsch responded in the same language.

The report of the Committee on Journal was, in the absence of its chairman, Rabbi Heller, presented by Rabbi Greenburg, and was on motion, received and adopted.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON JOURNAL.

The President's last annual report (Year-Book, vol. XVIII, p. 154) expressed regret over the announcement that, with the current year, the only English magazine devoted to Jewish literature and scientific subjects, the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, will suspend publication. Reference having been made to previous propositions that the Conference publish a scientific quarterly, it was suggested that the disappearance of the *Quarterly* had changed the situation, and might render advisable the publication of a Conference Literary Annual after the model of the *Jahrbuch fuer Juedische Geschichte und Literatur*.

The Committee appointed to report on the President's message (p. 93) did not think that an annual would meet the existing needs, and therefore proposed that "a committee be appointed to look into the matter to determine the feasibility of publishing a monthly or bi-monthly journal under the auspices of the Conference, but through an outside publishing firm, so that we assume no financial responsibility." Under the adoption of this report, amended so as to leave out "monthly or bi-monthly," the undersigned were appointed as a Committee on Journal.

Some months after the appointment of the Committee the Jewish press made announcement to the effect that the directors of Dropsie College had taken over the *Jewish Quarterly Review* from its English publishers, and that the magazine would henceforth be published in this country under the auspices of that college.

It is the unanimous opinion of your Committee that, under these circumstances, the situation as referred to by the President in his respective recommendation has materially changed, and that it would not be advisable now to issue a rival publication of scientific and literary character until the new enterprise had been launched and tested. In the interest of American-Jewish scholarship we believe it to be the duty of every loyal Jew to lend his support to the new publication until such time as there may be reason for either withholding encouragement or entering into a rival enterprise.

With the knowledge and authority of the rest of the Committee I have entered into correspondence with the President of Dropsie College, Dr. Cyrus Adler, informing him as to our disposition, and inquiring whether he was ready to propose some *modus operandi* whereby the Conference might be enabled, in some practicable way, to participate in the publication of the *Quarterly*. Dr. Adler, in reply, hesitated to call a special meeting for consultation on the matter, as "I do not see, after carefully reading your letters, that you have made any proposition which I could submit." He authorizes me to state, however, that "any scientific contribution from any person will be welcomed, and the question of publication decided solely upon the merits of the contribution."

Taking all these facts into mature and kindly consideration, your Committee recommends that we temporarily abandon our plans of a separate scientific publication, inasmuch as there seems to be reasonable prospect that the enterprise fathered by Dropsie College may furnish a satisfactory forum for scholarly work in this country in the field of Jewish science.

MAX HELLER, *Chairman*,
WM. H. GREENBURG,
MEYER LOVITCH.

On motion, duly seconded and carried, the report of the Committee on Nominations was made the order of business for three o'clock, Tuesday afternoon.

The following amendment to Article III, Section 1, of the Constitution, was offered by Rabbi Stolz:

Professors of rabbinical seminaries, active and retired rabbis of congregations, graduates of a rabbinical seminary, and rabbis not graduates of a rabbinical seminary, who have for three consecutive years been in charge of a congregation, shall be eligible to membership.

The report of the Committee on Domestic Service was presented by its Chairman, Rabbi Berkowitz.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC SERVICE.

To the President and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee appointed to prepare a series of prayers for the use of individuals in private worship, herewith submits its completed work.

In view of the fact that the Union Prayer-Book contains a number of such prayers, your Committee determined to begin with these, making some necessary revision. They have added all other prayers needed to meet the requirements of the individual in daily life and at the various crises and experiences of joy and sorrow, in which, according to Jewish usage, it is customary to voice the sentiments of the human heart in prayer.

The table of contents indicates what these are.

For the sake of brevity and simplicity the Committee has decided upon one form of prayer for each occasion, instead of offering several, as is done in other collections of this kind.* Some of the ancient bene-

* Members of the Conference are requested to indicate to the Committee their choice of either (a) or (b) on the Night Prayer for Adults.

dictions have also been retained because of their high moral, religious and pedagogical value, sanctified as they are by their use through many generations.

We have carefully guarded against the inclusion of any prayers for the minister. These belong to the minister's Hand-Book, the compilation of which was assigned to another committee.

In the retention of Hebrew, we have followed the general plan of the Union Prayer-Book. The English of the Bible texts and the translation of ritual prayers has been made to conform to those already contained in the Union Prayer-Book. Inasmuch as there are occasional differences in these translations as now embodied in the Union Prayer-Book, the Committee has been obliged to decide between these or to modify and alter them.

Your Committee recommends (a) that the printed manuscript herewith submitted be carefully read by each member, and revisions and suggestions be sent to the Secretary of this Committee not later than February 1, 1910; (b) that your Committee be given authority to reject all revision offered after that date and proceed to the final redaction and publication; (c) that the book be published as an Appendix to the Daily Prayers of the Union Prayer-Book under the caption "Personal Prayers;" (d) that it be issued also in a cheap pocket edition under the title, "Personal Prayers from the Union Prayer-Book," edited and published by the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY BERKOWITZ, *Chairman*,

C. A. RUBENSTEIN,

M. SALZMAN,

I. LANDMAN,

ELI MAYER, *Secretary*.

The first recommendation was adopted.

The second recommendation was read.

Rabbi Stolz—I move to strike out the word "publication." I am not in favor of having the Committee publish this, for none of us have seen it. Here is a different type altogether, from that which we use in the Union Prayer Book. It would look very badly. The whole thing will have to be reset anyhow.

The motion was seconded.

Rabbi Salzman—I believe that most of the Committee on Domestic Service, were also on the Committee on Haggadah. By February 1, everybody that is interested in this work, should be

able to have seen this report. Every suggestion will be welcomed by the committee.

The motion was carried.

The third and fourth recommendations were adopted.

The report as amended, was adopted as a whole, with a vote of thanks to the committee.

The report of the Committee on Geiger Centenary was presented by its Chairman, Rabbi Kohler.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON GEIGER CENTENARY

With reference to the resolutions passed by your body at the Frankfort Conference (Year-Book XVIII, 56f.) your committee begs to report as follows:

The following members of the Conference have begun the preparatory work as contributors to the Geiger Memorial Volume:

Geiger's Biography, Hirsch	75 pages
Bibliography and notes on the Geiger family, Deutsch.....	30 pages
Geiger as Reformer, Philipson	75 pages
Geiger as Historian and Theologian, Kohler	75 pages
Geiger as Philosopher and Historian of Philosophy, Neumark...	50 pages
Geiger as Controversialist, Schulman	75 pages
Geiger as Rabbi and Preacher, Sale.....	50 pages
Geiger as Man of Letters, Enelow	50 pages

Total 480 pages

The contributions are expected to be in the hands of the Chairman ready for print, no later than February 15. The work is to appear on May 24, 1910, the one hundredth anniversary of Geiger's birth. It is not to exceed 500 pages.

The Committee recommends that all financial matters pertaining to the publication of this work, such as the awarding of contracts, selling price of the book, advance sales, etc., be referred to the Executive Committee with power to act.

Respectfully submitted:

K. KOHLER, *Chairman*.

E. G. HIRSCH.

D. PHILIPSON.

S. SCHULMAN.

D. NEUMARK.

H. G. ENELow.

G. DEUTSCH.

Rabbi Stolz—I move that we authorize the publication of this book. Seconded and carried.

Rabbi Kohler—The idea that underlies the change in the program of the committee from that presented last year is this: We felt that the mere translation will not be done by the members of the committee; a number simply refuse to do the work of translation, not because they think others might do the work in a better way, but because they felt that they could do a better work than simply translate Geiger's German into English. For this reason the committee has come to the conclusion that a number of contributors, instead of simply offering a centenary translation, should embody certain parts of Geiger's works in their respective essays. For instance, when Dr. Enelow writes on Geiger as a man of letters, he is expected to embody selections from Geiger on Leo da Modena. Again, Dr. Schulman, who is to write on Geiger as a controversialist, will embody what Geiger wrote against his various opponents. In other words, that which was first intended will now be carried out in a far better way, because it will not be merely a translation, but will present essays containing selected translations, to make it more readable and more interesting.

Rabbi Silverman—The Conference was not even bound last year. The committee brought in a report, the whole of which is given here (Yearbook XVIII, 56f). In this report papers were assigned to six men, some of whom were different from those to whom they are assigned this year. Consequently, this is an entirely new report. I move that the committee take under consideration the plan of requesting all the members of the Conference to write essays on Geiger and report back to the Conference tomorrow morning.

The Chair—The motion is, as I understand it is, that we shall institute prize essays on Geiger, which shall be referred to the committee, which shall select the essays worthy of publication.

Rabbi Foster—I think we ought to have more translation. I amend that the work of the five men as read be retained, and

that in addition two hundred pages of Geiger's works shall be translated. Seconded.

Rabbi Enelow—There are two ways of looking at this matter; you might consider it as a joke and you might consider it as very serious. At first I was inclined to consider it a joke. I think it is a very serious matter, insofar as it concerns those members that have been asked to write the papers. They did not appoint themselves; they were asked by the Conference to make a special study of Geiger and prepare this memorial volume. I do not see how it would be anything short of utter discourtesy to say to these men, "We do not want you to do this work, because we feel we ought to let somebody else do it." I think it would be discourteous to the other members of the Conference after these men were asked two years ago to make studies of certain phases of Geiger's works to now give them to somebody else.

The Chair—I wish to place before the Conference this statement which I offer as the interpretation of the action of the Conference in the entire Geiger matter. This Conference decided at the Indianapolis Convention in 1906 to celebrate the centennial of Geiger by publishing a Geiger memorial volume. The Conference at that time appointed a committee to prepare this volume. My understanding is that these men, headed by Dr. Kohler, were to write this volume, and they themselves determined upon its contents. The Conference by adopting the report of the committee at the Frankfort Conference authorized the committee to proceed to carry out this plan of work, thus presented and approved. This is my interpretation. If you feel that I am mistaken I will entertain any motion.

No motion was made.

The Chair—All those who accept this interpretation of the Chair on the Geiger matter as the intention of the Conference will please say aye.

The nays were likewise called for. By an overwhelming majority the interpretation offered by the Chair was endorsed.

Rabbi Stolz—I offer a substitute motion, that this report be referred back to the committee to consider all the arguments presented in this discussion and report again tomorrow morning. Seconded.

The motion was lost.

Rabbi Foster's amendment was put and lost.

Rabbi Silverman's motion was put and lost.

Rabbi Deutsch—It seems to me that we should confer upon the committee the power to omit at their discretion the bibliography proposed in a previous report.

On motion, duly seconded, this power was conferred upon the committee.

On motion, duly seconded, the power to award contracts and administer all other financial matters connected with the Geiger volume, was entrusted to the Executive Committee.

The Conference adjourned.

TUESDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 16, 1909.

The Conference was opened with prayer by Rabbi Charles J. Freund.

The minutes of the preceding day were read and approved.

The report of the Committee on Religious Work in Universities was presented by the Chairman, Rabbi Calisch, and on motion was received and taken up *seriatim*.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELIGIOUS WORK IN UNIVERSITIES.

To the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

BRETHREN—Your Committee on Religious Activities among Students in Universities, beg leave to report that we have communicated with the members of the Conference, requesting data, and from what has been given us, we submit the following facts:

1. There is considerable religious activity among Jewish students at the various universities and colleges throughout the country, but it is by no means as great or as widespread as it should be.

2. There are several causes that contribute to the absence of religious activities at some universities, among which are—

(a) The small number of students, at most universities.

(b) The distance of many college seats from a regularly organized Jewish community.

(c) The fact, much to be deplored, that too many Jewish students are indisposed to encourage or participate in any sort of religious activity. It was reported by some Rabbis that Jewish students refuse to attend Jewish services, that they do not wish to be differentiated from their fellow students, some even going so far as to change their names and otherwise attempt to hide their Jewish identity. While this fact makes the exercise of this function the more difficult, it is but an added reason why we should make greater efforts to arouse the Jewish consciousness in these young men, and call them back from their unmanly course.

3. In the larger universities, where the number of students makes it possible, there are organizations among the Jewish students. Of such organizations there are at Harvard, the Menorah Society; at Columbia, Zeta Beta Tau; at the University of Minnesota, also Zeta Beta Tau; at Cornell, a society; at Chicago, the Maimonides Society, and at the University of Illinois, the Ivrim Society.

These societies are literary, rather than religious, in character, and their meetings are not so much for divine service as for intellectual purposes. They have lectures, debates, papers, discussions, etc. At Ann Arbor, the University of Michigan, there is a considerable number of Jewish students, and they are looked after by Rabbis Franklin of Detroit, and Kahn of Grand Rapids. Rabbi Franklin reports that he has suggested to his congregation, the desirability of building a chapel at Ann Arbor for the Jewish students, and that his congregation is considering the suggestion. It is to be hoped that they will act favorably upon it.

In the instances where universities are located in large cities, where religious organizations obtain, the spiritual wants of the Jewish students are looked after by the local Rabbis, as in Chicago, Cleveland, Baltimore, San Francisco, Providence, R. I., etc. The students' names are enrolled on the congregational lists, notices of all meetings, services, social functions, etc., are sent to them regularly, with invitation to attend. In some cities the students are teachers in the congregational Sabbath Schools. Some excellent work has also been done by a few Rabbis, who have made it a point to become personally acquainted with the students and to encourage them to identify themselves with the Jewish communities.

At some other universities, situated at a distance from Jewish communal organizations, excellent work has been accomplished by neighboring Rabbis, who paid occasional visits and gave occasional addresses.

Your committee deplores the fact that there is no systematic effort made in this highly important work. It is true that for a number of rea-

sons we cannot as yet have a system, national in its organization and scope, like the Young Men's Christian Association, that has effective branches of a national society at every university. Nevertheless, it is a phase of his duty, that should strongly appeal to every Rabbi, and your committee, therefore, desires to recommend (I) this work to every Rabbi in the country and to urge him to give it his earnest and serious attention, that we may arouse Jewish sentiment and loyalty in the breasts of the college-bred men of our country. These are the men who, by virtue of their training, are destined to be, if not the actual leaders, yet certainly the prominent members of their several communities. The desirability of having them loyal to the synagogue and reverently attached to the faith is so obvious that it needs no more than the mentioning.

It is true that an occasional lecture is not the best type of the work that is to be done, yet in view of our inability to command anything more, in many instances, it is earnestly recommended (II) that every Rabbi should make it his duty to visit the university in his city or vicinity, to seek the personal acquaintance of the Jewish students, to call them together to give them, if possible, a series of addresses, or at least one address during each session. It will help to stimulate the Jewish consciousness and remind these young men of their sacred heritage.

Your committee further recommends (III) that in the larger cities the Rabbi should see to it that notices and invitations to congregational functions should be regularly sent to Jewish students, attendant at the local university or college; that in the smaller cities, where no religious facilities exist, the Rabbi of the neighboring town should send personally a note before the various holidays, advising the students of the date of their occurrence. Even where the student cannot attend services, he is reminded of the holiday and he appreciates the personal remembrance of him by the Rabbi.

Your committee further recommends (IV) that an advanced course in Jewish history and religious development be prepared, suitable for the grasp and abilities of advanced students.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD N. CALISCH, *Chairman*,
H. ENGLANDER,
EMANUEL KAHN.

The first recommendation was adopted.

Rabbi Nathan Stern—I should like to have the committee incorporate this in its report. In my work at Princeton I found that one thing was essential. The method pursued there is that the students must attend chapel, except such as are exempted therefrom because of a letter from their parents. I

have tried to impress on such students as I come in contact with that this letter should be forthcoming. I should like to call the attention of the members of this Conference to the necessity of instructing their boys that go to Princeton, or colleges run on the same basis, that they remain away from chapel. I think self-respect should require that. All that is necessary is that a letter be obtained from the parents. I therefore move that the committee incorporate in this section of their report a suggestion to the members of this Conference urging them to encourage Jewish university students not to attend chapel, and especially to obtain letters from home to excuse them. Seconded.

Rabbi Kornfeld—This recommendation, it seems to me, is exceedingly narrow and decidedly un-Jewish. We hear a great deal about Reform Judaism wishing to assimilate whatever is good in any philosophy or creed. Now we are to put ourselves on record as asking our boys who go to the University not to enter a chapel. The thing we should ask them to do is to absorb everything that is good, no matter from where it comes. We want to strengthen the Jewish consciousness. We want something positive, and not something negative. The thing to do is to have the Jewish boys in your synagogue and give them a course in Jewish history, at whatever time they can meet you, as we are doing in Ohio.

Rabbi Berkowitz—I wish to add my word as protesting against this motion. Our work should be constructive—to provide something where there is nothing provided. My experience has led me to conclude that attendance on non-Jewish services has the effect of throwing the Jew back on his own Jewish spirit and strengthens it.

Rabbi Harris—May I suggest that the mover frame his motion thus, That Jewish students be excused from chapel attendance, on the one hand, and the local rabbis seek to supply something of the synagogue on the other hand?

The motion as thus framed was carried.

The second recommendation was adopted.

The third recommendation was adopted.

The fourth recommendation was read.

Rabbi Berkowitz—The general criticism of the Chautauqua courses is that they are too advanced. The course on Jewish religion has been written by Rev. Morris Joseph, of London. There are no students in our colleges who would feel that this is too simple for their use. All the courses of the Chautauqua are tentative; if you can get up anything better, do so.

Rabbi Calisch—What success has there been in the University of Pennsylvania?

Rabbi Berkowitz—Not very great, because the boys do not want to take on extra work.

The fourth recommendation was adopted.

Rabbi Stolz—I did not hear the whole report; as I came in I heard some mention of the work in Ann Arbor. I received a letter this morning from Champaign, Illinois. This community is not strong or wealthy enough to maintain a congregation or build a synagogue. It is no more than proper that the Jews of this country help the Jews of Ann Arbor and Champaign. I move that we recommend to the national bodies of this country the advisability of rendering aid of some sort to these communities to enable them to have regular services. Seconded and carried.

The report was adopted as a whole.

At the request of the President, Rabbi Harris occupied the Chair during the presentation and discussion of the Report of the Committee on President's Message. This was read by Rabbi Berkowitz, Chairman of the committee.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE,

To the Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN—Your committee on President's Message begs leave to report as follows:

The twentieth annual convention of the C. C. A. R. will be ever memorable in the annals of this organization. The celebration of the Einhorn centenary indicates the essential unity which has been brought about

among the various elements of Reform Judaism in America. Old misunderstandings have been cleared away and a spirit of co-operation has been engendered, which is rich in promise for the future. The founder of our Conference, that great protagonist of American Judaism, is singularly justified of his hopes. The splendid emphasis laid upon the ideal of Reform Judaism in the President's message, that "the Conference continues the line of Jewish tradition, but it evaluates traditions according to their power to express the message of religion to living men," indicates clearly the religious attitude of our Conference. The C. C. A. R. endorses this platform of progress and pledges itself through its members to carry out the ideals of Reform Judaism.

We congratulate the Conference on the development of its various activities. Each year's growth marks the increasing usefulness of our organization. Through Prayer-book, Hymnal, Haggadah, Tracts, Sermonic Literature and Year-Book the Conference influences American Israel at vital points, and contributes to its progress and growth. The free distribution of our liturgic publications to institutions is especially commended and the same policy is recommended for the future.

We rejoice in the excellent progress of the Bible translation and hope soon to have the completed version in our hands. We heartily endorse the President's recommendation as to the Bible Fund, and suggest that a committee of our members be appointed to co-operate with a similar committee from the Jewish Publication Society to secure funds for this purpose.

We recommend that the Executive Committee devise ways and means of securing through our members 10,000 subscriptions to the Bible translation payable in advance, thus making possible the publication of the book at fifty cents per copy.

The plan to co-operate more fully with the Board of Synagogue and School Extension of the U. A. H. C. for the inauguration of services at summer resorts is endorsed. We urge a more vigorous carrying out of this project.

In view of the importance of the TRACT as a factor in religious work, particularly in interpreting Judaism and the Jew to the world, we again urge upon all members of the Conference that special efforts be made to obtain contributions to the Tract Fund from congregations and individuals.

The invaluable services of Abraham Geiger to the cause of Jewish Science and Reform Judaism call for the most generous and general commemoration. We gladly endorse the suggestion that the centenary of Geiger's birth, May 24, be fittingly celebrated on or near that date by our several congregations.

The need for a proper magazine for our Sabbath-school children is generally felt. We earnestly commend the efforts of the editor and publisher of "Young Israel" to meet this need. We urge upon the members

of the Conference that they make every personal endeavor to support this magazine.

With reference to religious work among the Jewish farmers we recommend that this be taken up by our Conference conjointly with the U. A. H. C. and the various Jewish Agricultural Aid Societies, whose co-operation we should seek in this matter.

The cases which occasionally arise of dispute between rabbi and congregation, in which the good offices of the Conference may be of value in adjusting these strained relations justify the existence of a Board of Arbitration. We recommend that the incoming Executive Committee again appoint a committee of three of our members for the adjudication of such cases as may be brought before it.

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the organization of the Alliance Israelite Universelle, the C. C. A. R. most heartily felicitates that body on the splendid work which it has accomplished in unifying the efforts of all Israel in behalf of our unfortunate brethren in lands of oppression. We recommend that a letter to this effect be addressed by the incoming Executive Committee to the A. I. U. and that Shabbas Zachor be designated as an appropriate occasion on which to call the attention of our congregations to the work of the A. I. U. and to solicit funds for its support.

We wish to offer our retiring President and his fellow-officers, our hearty congratulations upon the excellent work which the Conference has accomplished under their able guidance.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY BERKOWITZ, *Chairman.*

DAVID MARX.

MARTIN A. MEYER.

HENRY COHEN.

M. FRIEDLANDER.

K. KOHLER.

JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF.

M. SCHLESINGER.

JOSEPH STOLZ.

SAMUEL SCHULMAN.

LOUIS WOLSEY.

On motion, the report was received and taken up *seriatim*.

Recommendation I was adopted.

Recommendation II was read.

Rabbi Stolz—It was stated that if our Conference could obtain ten thousand one dollar subscriptions, totalling ten thousand dollars, the Jewish Publication Society would raise fifteen thou-

sand dollars. With twenty-five thousand dollars they could issue their Bible translation at fifty cents a volume. Those subscribing one dollar would get two copies.

Rabbi Raisin—Ten thousand subscribers would mean an average of fifty for each member of the Conference. Some of our members could not get this many names. Every member of the Conference should try to get a minimum of names, and then as many more as possible. Even in those communities where there are many Jewish families it may not be possible to get many to subscribe. Some have Bibles; others may not care to subscribe. I amend this suggestion that we fix a minimum of twenty-five names for each member of the Conference, and as many more as possible.

Rabbi Gries—I wish to say that the committee suggests merely that we get ten thousand subscriptions. In the large cities, and especially in the Sabbath Schools, it ought not be difficult to get hundreds of subscriptions. The Conference should undertake a campaign for the ten thousand subscriptions, and the definite plan should be referred to a committee, or to the Executive Committee, to formulate and carry out.

Rabbi Philipson—Rabbi Raisin has raised a question of mere detail. I am with Rabbi Gries, that we put ourselves on record for at least ten thousand. This will be an easy task. Last year, when the matter was first broached, I suggested the matter in my own Bible class. The mere suggestion brought out one hundred and fifty subscriptions. I think in Cincinnati we can get hundreds of subscriptions without any trouble.

Rabbi Schulman—While I am altogether in accord with what has been said, I go a step further; I suggest that we add that efforts be made to obtain a Bible fund. Not only should we sell the Bible as cheaply as possible, but we should also distribute it free of charge. We have an opportunity to bring the English language to our brethren from foreign lands when they arrive. Our people frequently receive their Scriptures from a missionary. I would even add to the report of the committee that the members of the Conference make what efforts they can in order to

create a Bible fund, so that when necessary copies of the Bible may be distributed free.

Rabbi Deutsch—Unfortunately, I was not present at last year's Conference, and could not have expected that the action of this body in 1907 would be reversed, and the car of this Conference hitched to that of its bitterest enemies. I will vote "No" on every recommendation of this venture. My understanding was that we were to revise the Revised version, according to Jewish interpretation. I feel it my duty to vote "No," and explain my vote now.

Rabbi Philipson—I regret to have heard the statement that has just been made. I think the time has come when we should forget the bitter animosities of the past. It is the work of rabbis to further peace and union.

Recommendation II was adopted.

The third recommendation was read.

Rabbi Philipson—I stated in my address that I had had a conference with the Board of Synagogue and School Extension on the question of services at summer resorts; they are willing to furnish the funds.

The recommendation was adopted.

The fourth recommendation was read.

Rabbi Morgenstern—One practical aspect of this will bear consideration. We have three funds for which we are soliciting contributions. One is bound to militate against the other. I offer the amendment that this matter of soliciting funds be referred to a committee, to work out some definite scheme—or the Executive Committee—by which we can approach the public in a proper and dignified way, in order to make the cause or causes for which we ask contributions as strong as possible.

The suggestion was accepted by the Chairman and the recommendation as modified was adopted.

Recommendation V was adopted.

Recommendation VI was read.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I ask the courtesy of the floor to speak a few words about "Young Israel." The matter I have to bring

before the Conference at this moment is one of considerable importance to "Young Israel." You will remember that at the Indianapolis Convention the Conference was informed that the Union of American Hebrew congregations was seriously considering the publication of a journal such as this, because it was felt that there was need of such a paper. The Conference voted its approval of this plan, and furthermore authorized a subvention for this purpose, and expressed the conviction that there was need of such a paper in our Sunday-Schools. Many members pledged their support to this work. I am sorry to say the support has not come forth. It was actually through your endorsement of this work, or of this proposition, that "Young Israel" was brought into existence. It has since been in the hands of two publishers, both of whom have sunk a great deal of money in this enterprise. I feel personally, as a member of the Conference, and likewise as one interested in the success of "Young Israel," that this Conference has a large responsibility in this paper. It is not right for its members to sit back and say, "That is not the paper we want." Even granting that "Young Israel" is not yet a perfect Sunday-School paper—even if it were a poor Sunday-School paper, which I do not think it is, nevertheless this Conference is pledged to support "Young Israel." We are trying to improve it and to make it satisfy the needs of the various congregations. We do not ask for any subvention. We expect "Young Israel" to stand upon its own merits, and these merits we are laboring earnestly to give it. But if the Conference does not support "Young Israel" now in the time of its struggle, there will be no future for it. I ask that each individual member of the Conference feel sufficient interest in the paper to recommend it most heartily to his Sunday-School, Temple, Board, etc. Probably one-half of the subscribers of "Young Israel" are found among our orthodox brethren. I have a list here, if any of you wish to see it, of the number of children subscribing to "Young Israel" in the Sabbath Schools of every member of this Conference. You would be surprised at the figures. The members of this Con-

ference have not supported "Young Israel" as they should. I hope that from now on "Young Israel" will receive the support from this Conference that it deserves and that it is receiving in a way from others.

The recommendation was adopted.

Recommendations VII, VIII and IX were adopted.

Recommendation X was adopted by a rising vote.

The report was adopted as a whole.

The President's message having contained a report and a recommendation on the publication of tracts, the Committee on Tracts found it unnecessary to submit an additional report.

Rabbi Nathan Stern delivered a memorial address on Rabbi Adolph M. Radin. (cf. Appendix k).

The report of the Committee on Memorial Resolutions for Departed Members was read by its secretary, Rabbi Brill.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS.

Your Committee on Memorial Resolutions begs to present the following report:

The members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, in convention assembled, having learned of the demise of their beloved co-laborers, and fellow members, Adolph M. Radin, Joseph Herz, Solomon Sonnenschein and Louis Weiss, hereby express their sense of sorrow in the following resolutions:

Dr. Adolph M. Radin, a true lover of humanity, who has given his life to the work of lifting up the fallen and turning many to righteousness, and has thereby earned for himself the title of *Kohen Zedek*, has been called to his eternal reward. In his demise, the cause of Judaism has lost one of its sturdiest champions and humanity one of its noblest representatives. In his passing away, American Israel mourns the loss of a unique personality, who, as pathfinder in his special field of work, blazed the way for others, equally self-sacrificing, to devote themselves to the betterment of the unfortunate.

Adolph M. Radin had the good fortune of obtaining a thorough Talmudic training in Russia before going through a German University course. He thus combined a full understanding of the traditional Jewish life with a sympathy for the requirements of modern culture. These opportunities helped him to become a force for good in his work for the Americanization of the recent immigrants. His ready wit, his genial manner and his kindness of heart, made him also a power for good in his work as chaplain

of various penal and correctional institutions. Our Conference, which had the benefit of a valuable paper on his experiences in his particular line of work, will cherish a lasting remembrance for this noble teacher and man.

Joseph Herz, Rabbi of Congregation B'nai Israel of Columbus, Miss., in his life-time combined in himself the activities of a business career with the duties of rabbi. He was a man of true and honest purpose, clean in heart and pure of mind, one whose charity knew no creed, and who, in his complete unselfishness, lovable disposition and unfailing geniality and kindness, wrote an untarnished record of beautiful and whole-hearted service to his Maker and his fellowmen, exemplifying in golden deeds, the sublime ideals of Jewish manhood and character, thereby gaining the unfeigned love of every Jew and even non-Jew within the sphere of his influence.

Solomon Sonneschein labored for many years on behalf of Israel and for the advancement of Judaism. In him were united profound scholarship, brilliant intellectuality and exceptional eloquence, and gifted with these remarkable powers, he occupied a leading position in American Israel for many years.

Louis Weiss, rabbi of Congregation Beth Zion, Bradford, Pa., was a modest and humble laborer in the vineyard of Judaism, ministered earnestly and zealously, and devoted himself unselfishly to the furtherance of Israel's faith.

Be it resolved, That the Central Conference of American Rabbis deeply deplores the loss of these teachers in Israel, yet finds consolation in the words, **יָדַע יְהוָה יָמֵי תַּמִּימִים וְנַחֲלָתָם לְעוֹלָם תְּהִיָּה**

"The Lord knoweth the days of the upright and their portion shall be forever."

And be it further Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of the Conference and a copy of the same be transmitted to the mourning relatives and congregations of the deceased brothers.

Respectfully submitted,

MORRIS NEWFIELD, *Chairman*,

ABRAM BRILL, *Secretary*.

EMANUEL KAHN.

GEORGE SOLOMON.

JOS. S. KORNFELD.

B. C. EHRENREICH.

GUSTAV N. HAUSMANN.

The following memorial resolutions in honor of Rabbi Joseph Mayor Asher were adopted:

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, in annual session assembled, has learned with profound sorrow of the demise of the great

and learned teacher in Israel, Joseph*Mayor Asher, and feels it a duty of love to express its sense of keen loss to Jewish learning.

In the short time that he was permitted by an all-kind Providence to labor in the midst of American Israel, for the glorious and cherished ideals of the Jew, he had most signally displayed that wonderful ability to vitalize the ancient learning of our forefathers. By the charm of his magnetic personality and the power of his teaching, this learning became a living message to all coming under the sphere of his influence.

Both as teacher and preacher his demise leaves an aching void in the hearts of his pupils and his congregation. Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Conference deeply sympathizes with the grief-stricken widow and with the Jewish Theological Seminary, to which institution he had for years given of his intellectual attainments. Be it furthermore

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of the Central Conference of American Rabbis and a copy be sent to the widow, to the Jewish Theological Seminary and to the congregation mourning his loss.

MORRIS NEWFIELD, *Chairman*.

ABRAM BRILL.

EMANUEL KAHN.

GEORGE SOLOMON.

JOS. S. KORNFIELD.

B. C. EHRENEBEICH.

GUSTAV N. HAUSMANN.

The report was adopted by a rising vote. Rabbi Deutsch led in the recital of Kaddish for the departed members.

The following resolution was presented and adopted by a unanimous vote:

Bearing in mind the arrangements made between both Turkey and Roumania, and the Powers by the Berlin Treaty in 1878, whereby Turkey agreed to introduce reforms in the government for the protection of Christians, the steps taken to be superintended by the Powers, and Roumania agreed to grant and protect the equal rights of Jews as citizens, and

Whereas, these agreements have not been kept, but many thousands of Armenian Christians have been barbarously murdered, with little but expressions of sympathy resulting from the Powers, and the Jews in Roumania have been persecuted, robbed of their rights, and deprived of citizenship, without any protest from the Powers, and

Whereas, these conditions have long been a disgrace before the civilized world,

We, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, now put ourselves on record as urging the governments of the civilized world, particularly the Signatory Powers of the Berlin Treaty, to take vigorous and persevering action for the protection of Armenian Christians in Turkey, and for the protection of and granting of rights of citizenship to Jews in Roumania.

(Signed) S. SCHULMAN.
G. DEUTSCH.
H. G. ENELOW.

A recess of fifteen minutes was taken to see the children of the Education Alliance School salute the flag and in other exercises.

When the Conference reconvened Rabbi Foster read his paper on "The Workingman and the Synagogue." (Cf. Appendix I.) The discussion was led by Rabbis Harris and Henry Cohen. (Cf. Appendix I, close.)

The courtesy of the floor was extended to a non-member of the Conference.

Mr. Allen—Rabbi Foster has said that of the 200,000 Jewish workingmen in this city, 25 percent, 50,000, observe the Sabbath; 150,000 violate the Sabbath. But there are at least another 100,000 Jewish workingmen who would be glad to observe the Sabbath if they were not employed on that day. Members of your congregations employ 80 percent of these workingmen, either directly or indirectly, through contractors. If you were doing your duty to Jewish workingmen by urging the members of your congregations to let the workingmen have their Sabbath it would be different. It is because you do not do that that the workmen are unable to be at the synagogue on Saturday. The same rebuke may be applied to the orthodox. It shows that the one has not the courage of their convictions while the others may not have the convictions at all.

On motion, the Conference adjourned to reconvene at 2:30 p. m., when the discussion of Rabbi Foster's paper would be resumed.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON.

The Conference reassembled at 2:45 p. m. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise was given the floor.

Rabbi Wise—Mr. Chairman and members of the Conference: I have no desire to disturb the pleasure of the Conference in its apparent enjoyment of the symposium of platitudinous pomposity of this morning. I shall speak to you this afternoon from my viewpoint, and not from the pewpoint, which is the viewpoint occupied by so many men. In the first place I want to protest against the very careful irrelevancy of very much adduced in this Conference. I challenge the right of a member of this Conference to allude to the white slave criminal and white slave traffic under the head of the workingmen. It is not they who conduct the white slave trade, it is their daughters who are the victims of the slave traffic, because the synagogue is not true to the workingmen. We have heard a great deal about the shame of temporary synagogues; I want to say something about the shame of permanent synagogues, insofar as they commit themselves to the program which we heard today. The church knows these questions; we do not. The churches are trying to grapple with the problem; we come with complacency and grapple with things of form, instead of grappling with the most searching problems of our age. I want to deal first with the secondary cause of the alienation of the workingman, the dogmatism of the church, which the synagogue does not so much share. We have heard that the synagogue does not deal with secondary problems. Oh no; only with those of primary importance! One of the tremendous concerns of the Kehillah has been the question of Kashruth. Is that of primary concern today in New York? Are the reform synagogues any more truly than the orthodox dealing with primary questions?

I pass over to three fundamental principles: the synagogue can not deal with the workingman; the synagogue can not attract the workingman; the synagogue has no word for the workingman, except the report of this morning, unless these things are true; the synagogue must have an open door and

the synagogue must have a free pulpit. The workingman will have nothing to do with the synagogue unless it is in earnest; the workingman is in earnest; he says this is the biggest thing on the horizon of present day life. The poor man is not, and can not be, welcomed into the synagogue under the synagogue's regulations and administration which it maintains today. One synagogue exacts \$50.00; another \$40.00 a year. There are synagogues where \$40.00 or \$50.00 is only the minimum, that one may sit in the company of the mighty. You say, "How it is in your own synagogue?" There are in my own synagogue members who give \$1.00, \$2.00, \$5.00 a year, as there are others who give \$500.00, \$1,000.00 and \$2,000.00 a year. Let any member of the Conference tell me if he has any large numbers who give \$5.00 and \$10.00 a year.

A Rabbi—I have plenty who give only \$5.00.

Rabbi Wise—I corrected a statement made by Rabbi Foster a few days ago in the presence of three witnesses. I said three members of the Jewish ministry of America said to me in one year, "We are going out of the pulpit, because we have not a pulpit like yours." They did not mean that the congregation was a poor one, but because every word the Rabbi of the Free Congregation speaks is spoken in freedom. I could cite illustrations. I said to one of the foremost rabbis of New York, "Why don't you take a stand and come out and take your position against this tremendous thing?" His answer was, "I would do it if I could, but I don't stand in a free pulpit as you do." My fundamental contention is that after all you can't get the workingman to respect the synagogue, and I don't want the synagogue to be respected unless its pulpit is free.

You may ask me, "What have you done about the synagogue and the workingman?" I will tell you what I did. I was asked last summer to have a part in the bakers' strike in New York. I investigated it. I did not talk about general principles. I went down and found Jewish bakers treated almost like slaves. I told their Jewish masters that it was an outrage. And that strike was settled by the strikers gaining, as they ought

to have gained, every single point for which they had contended. They did not ask enough. They did not ask even human conditions. They asked for the minimum. And it was given to me to present their claim to their employers.

We must be true to Judaism. The synagogue deals with this world. Its characteristic is what has been called the thought and spirit of this-worldliness. We have that infinite advantage over the Christian churches, that we do not talk about the future world, but deal with present-day conditions. You said this: the principles of the whole business were founded by the synagogue. Yes, they were founded by the synagogue, not one jot or tittle needs to be added. The question is, are we maintaining these things and defending them or holding them in abeyance? A year ago it was said in one of the Jewish seminaries, "It is all right to speak about great moral principles, but you must not apply them." That is a new idea to me. We are told a rabbi may deal with these things, but not as a representative of the synagogue. Why not? If the synagogue has laid down these principles, why should not we speak out and deal frankly and fairly as men? One thing more. I ventured to say a few days ago, "If I deal with the synagogue and the workingman, instead of saying, 'Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk,' I would say, 'You shall not seethe a mother in a workshop.'" The Jews here on the East Side are becoming a Sabbathless people—they can't observe the Sabbath and they won't observe Sunday.

At 3 p. m. the regularly scheduled order of business, the report of the Committee on Nominations, was called for and presented by its Chairman, Rabbi Gries.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS.

To the President and Members of the Conference:

Your Committee on Nominations begs to present as its report the following nominations:

<i>Honorary President</i>	Kaufman Kohler
<i>President</i>	Maximilian Heller
<i>Vice-President</i>	Samuel Schulman

Treasurer Moses J. Gries
Recording Secretary Julian Morgenstern
Corresponding Secretary David Marx

Executive Committee:

Israel Aaron,	Charles S. Levi,
Henry Berkowitz,	David Philipson,
Henry Cohen,	William Rosenau,
William S. Friedman,	Isaac Rypins,
Maurice H. Harris,	Joseph Stolz.
Emil G. Hirsch,	

Respectfully submitted,

MOSES J. GRIES, *Chairman*.
 W. FINESHEIBER.
 S. FOSTER.
 LEO M. FRANKLIN.
 M. H. HARRIS.
 N. KRASS.
 M. SALZMAN.
 A. SIMON.

On motion, duly seconded, the nominations were closed, and the Recording Secretary was instructed to cast the ballot for the members nominated in the report.

On motion, duly seconded and carried, the President was instructed to send a message of notification and congratulation to Rabbi Heller.

The report of the Auditing Committee was presented by its Chairman, Rabbi Harris.

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE.

GENTLEMEN—Your Committee has carefully gone over the accounts and found them correct. It approves the recommendation relative to the Haggadah: that is, that congregations purchase quantities to sell or distribute to their members, in order to bring it to the notice of a larger number. It also approves the recommendation that the Year-Books be put on the free list.

The suggestion, however, as to the disposition of the old holiday sermons and the printing of new ones, it begs to refer to the Executive Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

ISRAEL AARON,
 I. L. RYPINS,
 A. LYONS,
 G. DEUTSCH,
 M. H. HARRIS, *Chairman*.

The report was received and adopted.

The two recommendations of the report of the Finance Committee, (I) that the interest on all investments of the Conference funds be divided equally between the General and Relief Funds, and (II) that the Tract Committee be instructed to make an active campaign for financial aid in order that tracts may be published in numbers sufficient to realize their intended purpose, and the Conference at the same time relieved of the burden of paying for tracts from the General Fund, of which the Auditing Committee had failed to take notice, were adopted by the Conference.

The report of the Committee on Resolutions was presented by its Chairman, Rabbi Enelow.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

To the Officers and Members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

GENTLEMEN—Your Committee to which was referred the report of the Committee on Contemporaneous History with its various resolutions and all other resolutions presented during the Conference, begs leave to present the following report:

I. With reference to the report of the Committee on Contemporaneous History your committee recommends that this Conference place on record its appreciation of the valuable services rendered the cause of Judaism and humanity by the several scholars, philanthropists and leaders, who have passed away since our last convention, and that the resolutions in memoriam set forth, be carried out. As a further mark of reverence for the departed, we recommend that the Conference rise and recite the Kaddish.

II. We endorse the suggestion of the Committee on Contemporaneous History, and recommend that the incoming Executive Committee consider the advisability of issuing literature in Yiddish, on the subject of Reform Judaism, setting forth its character and purpose.

III. Referring to that part of the report of the Committee on Contemporaneous History, calling attention to the urgent necessity of investigating the character of the various philanthropic institutions in Palestine, your committee recommends that the incoming Executive Board direct the attention to this matter of such national organizations, as the National

Conference of Jewish Charities and the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, within whose scope of work such investigation naturally falls.

IV. With regard to the various subventions set forth in the report, we recommend, that, in view of the importance of the publications of the M'kizze Nirdamin Society, the Central Conference of American Rabbis enroll as a member, contributing Ten Dollars per annum. As to the works of Lunetz, Ben Yehuda, Kahana and Eisenstein, we refer the consideration of subventions thereto, to the incoming Executive Committee. In this connection your committee recommends that all books received from subventions shall be stored in a special alcove, to be arranged for by the Executive Committee.

V. With reference to the resolution¹ calling for a subvention to enable Dr. Neumark to prosecute research work for his next volume on the history of Jewish Philosophy, your committee recommends that the attention of both individuals and other national organizations, be called to the great importance of this work, and to the need of subsidizing the same, and that the Executive Committee be authorized to appropriate for this purpose, a sum not to exceed One Hundred Dollars.

VI. In appreciation of the compliment paid the C. C. A. R. by the Rev. E. J. Stark, Cantor of Temple Emanu-El of San Francisco, in dedicating his musical settings of the Union Prayer Book to our organization, the Committee recommends that a vote of thanks be tendered the composer, and that the Corresponding Secretary be instructed to communicate the same to him.

VII. We recommend the adoption of the resolution² that a committee be appointed by the incoming Executive Committee, to prepare a revised certificate of conversion, to be submitted to the next Conference for adoption.

¹ Whereas it has been the policy of the Central Conference of American Rabbis to encourage Jewish literary research, and to extend both moral and financial support to the publication of important books in the department of Juedische Wissenschaft; and

Whereas, for the completion of his monumental work on Jewish Philosophy it is necessary for our fellow-member, Dr. Neumark, to have copies made of important manuscripts to be found in European libraries, involving an expenditure of One Thousand Dollars, therefore

Be it resolved that we recommend the importance of this project to the attention of individuals as well as other national bodies interested in the publication and promotion of Jewish literature, and

Be it further resolved that we recommend to the incoming Executive Committee the advisability of appropriating Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars for this purpose. (Signed) Joseph Stolz, G. Deutsch, I. S. Moses, I. L. Rypins, Joseph Krauskopf.

² Resolved, that the C. C. A. R. in order to assist its members in a situation that arises frequently, prepare through a proper committee a certificate of conversion, to be submitted to the next conference for adoption; the blank certificates to be kept in charge by the Corresponding Secretary and supplied to the members of the Conference free upon application. (Signed) Morgenstern, Berkowitz.

VIII. With regard to the resolution³ that the Conference endorse the work of the Council of Jewish Women for a purer public press, we place on record our commendation of the efforts of the Council of Jewish Women for the purification of the public press.

IX. Anent the resolution regarding mixed marriages,⁴ your committee, after mature deliberation, recommends the following expression of the sentiment of the Conference: The Central Conference of American Rabbis declares that mixed marriages are contrary to the tradition of the Jewish religion and should therefore be discouraged by the American Rabbinate.

Respectfully submitted,

H. G. ENELOW, *Chairman*.

M. C. CURRICK.

G. GEORGE FOX.

W. S. FRIEDMAN.

S. GOLDENSON.

A. GUTTMAN.

A. S. ISAACS.

C. S. LEVI.

D. MARX.

W. ROSENAU.

J. SILVERMAN.

The first recommendation was adopted.

The second resolution was read.

Rabbi Hausman—I feared, and for good reasons, that this would be understood as missionary work, and missionary work of alienating the young men from the old position. I think we should be very, very careful in regard to such an expression, or the use of the word itself.

The recommendation was adopted.

The third recommendation was read.

Rabbi Deutsch—I have not come to Zion except to hold my tongue. At the same time I wish to say I have no patience with that Philistine idea which says that Washington is our

³ The Council of Jewish Women among its various activities is undertaking one work that can not but meet the unqualified approval of every loyal and upright American, viz., the work for the purification of the public press.

Be it therefore resolved that the C. C. A. R. express its hearty endorsement of this work, and that this endorsement be recorded in the next yearbook. (Signed) Morgestern, Guttmacher.

⁴ Resolved, that it is the sentiment of this Conference that a Rabbi ought not to officiate at a marriage between a Jew or Jewess and a person professing a religion other than Judaism, inasmuch as such mixed marriage is prohibited by the Jewish religion and would tend to disintegrate the religion of Israel. (Signed) Samuel Schulman, William Rosenau.

Jerusalem and America our Palestine. I have no more patience than with those who say, rather than go to Europe to see your mother, go to the Old Woman's Home and see any number of old women. If a man says "Jerusalem does not mean any more to me than any old town," I have no patience with him. Palestine is a Jewish center; we have to have poor people there whether we want it or not. Here these people are. You have hospitals there—a necessity; you have homes for old women—a necessity. These people are rolling in the gutter as the greatest beggars. Here is an opportunity for them to learn a trade, and why should not we have a dollar to spare to help them?

Rabbi Enelow—There is no intention on the part of the committee to overlook the things mentioned by Dr. Deutsch. The committee felt that it is not within the province of this Conference to make such investigations; it has not the machinery to do so; it would be a risky thing for the Conference to assume the moral responsibility of recommending institutions as far away as Palestine. There are certain international organizations which we should try to induce to take care of this work. We recommended this work to the Conference as a very meritorious work indeed; we subscribe to everything of the sentimental character Dr. Deutsch mentioned. But such an organization as the National Jewish charities should undertake the examination of these conditions; we have not the machinery nor should we assume the moral responsibility of doing this work.

The recommendation was adopted.

The fourth recommendation was read.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I amend that the first half of the recommendation take the usual procedure of being referred directly to the Finance Committee; that the second half of the recommendation be referred to the Executive Committee, for decision as to the place and manner of this action. The Constitution provides that every recommendation for the expenditure of funds must be referred to the Finance Committee.

It was moved and seconded that the first part of the recom-

mendation be adopted, and that the Executive Committee be authorized to pay \$10.00 as the membership fee. Carried.

The second section of the fourth recommendation was adopted.

The last section of the fourth recommendation was adopted.

The fifth recommendation was adopted.

The sixth recommendation was adopted.

The seventh recommendation was read.

Rabbi Stolz—I move to amend that the Executive Committee be authorized to reprint the certificate that was drafted and approved at the Rochester Conference.

Seconded.

Rabbi Morgenstern—Inasmuch as I offered the resolution I will try to explain. The resolution was that a committee be instructed to prepare such a formula or blank, to be printed in quantities, and distributed to the members upon application to the Corresponding Secretary. In view of the fact that such a blank certificate does exist I suppose the first part of the resolution is unnecessary. The second is the important part, and this was lost sight of by the committee.

Rabbi Aaron—I should like to make an amendment to the amendment, that this original copy which we have be revised by this committee, and then either with or without the assistance of the Executive Board, be reprinted.

Rabbi Enelow—Dr. Morgenstern, who says he was the author of the resolution originally, states that we have failed to take notice of one part of the resolution. I wish to explain the reason why our report is as it is. The resolution provided for what was to be done after the preparation of the certificate was ordered. The committee felt that it was not advisable to determine what was to be done with this blank after it was printed. So many things have happened since the Rochester Conference that it seems advisable to have a new committee on this matter, for since this is to be a permanent blank, it is too important a matter to leave entirely to the Executive Committee without further action by the Conference.

Rabbi Frisch—I want to ask whether a conversion formula will not be printed in the minister's handbook.

Rabbi Enelow—These are not to be in a book, but in sheets, to be handed to anyone wishing them.

Rabbi Schulman—I believe this is a very important matter. The reason I support the amendment of Dr. Aaron is because it practically accomplishes the intention of both committees. The present wording is rather prolix and very unmanageable in practice. We do need a revision. The best way is to pass this amendment. The second amendment is to revise the present formula. If you carry the resolution as suggested by the committee, without having regard to Rabbi Stolz's suggestion, it means that you are practically devising new legislation; in this matter we should build on that which is already in the year books.

Rabbi Gries—There should be a revision of the whole action taken in Rochester.

Rabbi Enelow—This resolution has no reference to conversion as such, or to the character of the ceremony; it has reference only to the certificate of conversion.

Rabbi Gries—I offer the substitute motion that there be a revision of the whole matter as presented at Rochester.

The Chair—You will remember that at Rochester there was a report of a committee on conversion, containing a number of recommendations, the outcome of which was a formula to be subscribed to by the person converted. Our committee here simply brought in its report as to the formula or certificate. Rabbi Gries moves that the whole action taken in Rochester be reconsidered.

Rabbi Gries—I do not wish to arouse a discussion of this subject at this late hour, but the decision of the Rochester Conference contains certain provisions which I think none of us are living up to, and which are a dead letter to many rabbis of the Conference. I would like to have the thing referred to a committee for consideration and report. I therefore move that all previous actions of the Conference with reference to the proselyte question, the formula of conversion, etc., be referred to a committee for consideration and report to the next Conference.

Rabbi Rosenthal—This would be a motion to reconsider.

Rabbi Gries—With all deference to our rabbi lawyer, I think it is proper to reconsider the previous decision of a Conference. We do not want to change it. If we change it at all it will be done at the next Conference.

Rabbi Enelow—Mr. President, no matter what may be the preliminary aspect of the question, I think this is too important a question to be dealt with in this manner. The Committee on Resolutions never dealt with the whole question of conversion; the only question referred to it was of printing a formula of conversion. To go over the whole question is too big a subject to be disposed of in this resolution. We certainly would not want to deal with so big a problem in this manner. If the Conference wishes to reconsider its action in respect to conversion it should be a matter of new business.

The Chair—The Chair has so decided on the point of order of Rabbi Rosenthal. All the amendments fall to the ground because of this point of order. What is before you is the recommendation of the Committee on Resolutions, recommending the appointment of a committee to prepare a certificate of conversion, to report to the next Conference.

The eighth recommendation was adopted.

The ninth recommendation was read.

Rabbi Hirschberg—I move to table this resolution.

The motion was lost.

Rabbi Schulman—I rise as introducer of the resolution to speak in favor of the original resolution and against the wording of the report of the Committee on Resolutions. My original resolution read: "Resolved, That it is the sense of this Conference that a rabbi ought not to officiate at a marriage between a Jew or Jewess and a person professing a religion other than Judaism, inasmuch as such mixed marriage is prohibited by the Jewish religion and would tend to disintegrate the religion of Israel." I hope I will not be misunderstood. I have always respected men who differ with me. I have always been able to combine with that an absolutely unflinching loyalty to what I

thought and considered right. Now, gentlemen, I read a paper to you on mixed marriage; such a paper usually gets discussion on the floor of this Conference, but for reasons I need not mention the paper was not properly discussed. That paper presented to you certain arguments. The only way to meet the original resolution and prove its inadequacy is on the ground of academic argument. The gist of the paper was to prove that we have nothing to do with civil marriages; that the Jewish Church casts no aspersions on civil marriages, and permits anyone who wishes to have a civil marriage. The real spirit of the paper was to get an expression of the opinion of this Conference as to what is the province of a rabbi representing Judaism.

Rabbi Moses—If a resolution of this kind is passed it is the beginning of religious tyranny. A rabbi has sufficient information as to what is the Jewish religion and what it prohibits, and I lift up my hand and say it is not true that the Jewish religion prohibits marriage between Jew and non-Jew. It is all a question of relationship. This must be sifted by the rabbi. Now I warn you, my brethren, do not tie your own hands because one man is so fully enthused with his own conviction. We have liberty of conscience; we stand responsible to our congregations and to the consciousness of Judaism at large. Let the rabbi perform a marriage on proper occasions.

Rabbi Kohler—I must first make one remark in regard to what has just been said. It is not true that the relations between Jew and non-Jew in regard to marriage are such that a Jew and a Christian can marry with the approval of the Jewish traditions. According to the opinion of all Jewish authority, the Christian is a *ger toshab*. This position is also taken by the Christian Church. At the very moment the Christian Church departed from the synagogue, as recorded in the 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, it adopted this position in reference to Judaism. Consequently the Christian can from the point of view of the Jewish code be regarded only as a proselyte of the gate and can not intermarry. I therefore resent and reject the statement that this is not true; it is true accord-

ing to the Jewish view expressed in the codes and all other opinions, that the Jew and Christian can not marry religiously. They can marry civilly.

Rabbi Gries—I do not wish to speak at this time, but merely to ask Dr. Kohler a question. In his original resolution Rabbi Schulman stated that mixed marriages are prohibited by the Jewish religion. If I am not mistaken that means that they are prohibited by the Jewish law. Will Dr. Kohler tell me in what part of the law there is any such declaration?

Rabbi Schulman—I will state the law for you; the law is *en kiddushin tofsin*.

Rabbi Kaplan—I shall not speak on the subject; that can't be boiled down to three minutes. In other words, I have not the ability to discuss the subject in three minutes. I can state, however, in two or three sentences the very gist of this whole argument. A man comes to me, or a woman, and asks me, "What will you do in this case?" and I of course am not afraid to express my opinions, any more than the rest of the gentlemen are. I must give her or him some definite opinion. I can not evade. But this Conference this year, and last, and all other years that I have attended, always evades the question. I want to know, in addition to what I think, what does the Conference think on this subject? I want to know, because I have a high regard and a high reverence for the opinion of the men who stand bound together with us in the reform movement. I want to know whether your ideas are for or against, and let us not evade the question. I would therefore urge upon the Conference to vote one way or the other, so I may go home and say that the sense of the Conference is for or against.

Rabbi Foster—I wish to say just a few words upon this important subject. It has just been asked what is the law that prohibits mixed marriages. In this regard I would say, if we do not appeal to the laws of the past we must appeal to the law of the present, that is, the law of self-preservation. If we are going to preserve our religion we must take action decidedly in the affirmative on this very important and vexing question.

We may differ as to the interpretation of what we call non-essential laws, but here is one of the fundamentals, and if we avoid it we are cowards. I would say with regard to the limitation that would be placed upon our freedom, that reminds me of the action of a man who had a bit of dynamite in his hand, with which he was determined to dynamite a city. He was told "Do not dare do that, you will destroy the city." He said, "This is my right; I have a right to go into the city and throw dynamite into it." If you do not see why you must stop, I say it is dynamiting the Jewish religion. I personally have always refused to officiate at mixed marriages.

Rabbi Wintner—Let me tell you that during my forty-three years' ministry in this country I never solemnized a mixed marriage. And so it seems to me that the whole discussion amounts to nothing.

Rabbi Kornfeld—I do not remember whether Dr. Schulman made any mention of Geiger. Geiger in his comment on the resolution introduced at the Leipzig Conference, states explicitly that religiously intermarriage is permitted; only, he says, it is not advisable for the reason of the disintegration which might result. But religiously he states it is permissible. For that reason I say we are standing on reform ground, at the same time on strictly Jewish ground, when we declare that it is admissible, though expediency does not recommend it. I say there are times we should not allow intermarriage, where the circumstances show it would tend to the disintegration of Judaism. But I do not think a categorical position can be taken, in the face of what Geiger has said. A few years ago I was the subject of considerable criticism in the Jewish press for having solemnized a mixed marriage. I wrote two articles in defense of my position. At that time I felt as I feel now that each case should be judged on its own merits, as far as its influence on Judaism in the community is concerned.

Rabbi Harry Mayer—My position towards this resolution seems to be different from that of anybody who has spoken. I regard it as put not only as an evasion, but as decidedly per-

icious. The thing is to vote down the resolution. We are speaking constantly about the spirit of Einhorn. I want to remind you of what Einhorn said. He did not care if ten thousand rabbis took a stand on a question, he was going to maintain the stand he believed right. There is not the least doubt as to what the majority believe about the matter. The majority are against intermarriage, or rather all are against mixed marriages, and the majority are against officiating. No action will bind the minority in any way, but it might be construed by the laity as binding, and for that reason it is pernicious.

Rabbi Harris—I amend to substitute the original resolution for that of the committee. Seconded.

Rabbi Harris—Some gentlemen on this floor have protested against mixed marriage on the ground that it is not strictly forbidden in the Talmudic law. It is not honest for us when the Talmudic law is against us to say that we do not believe in it, and when there is a leniency in the Talmudic law to appeal to it. Now the next point, it might not have mattered had the question not been brought before us at all; it is before us now, gentlemen; realize the gravity of this situation. You dare not vote against it, because if you do, you make the situation ever so much worse than before. The word will go forth that the Central Conference as such indorsed mixed marriage—that will be the conclusion. Gentlemen, the moment the word has gone forth that rabbis indorse mixed marriage, Judaism will not live four generations.

Rabbi Elkin—As I understand the contention between reform Judaism and orthodox, the orthodox Jew goes according to the Shulchan Aruch. He is right. We reformers reject the decision of the rabbis, and yet when it suits us we make use of them. Why do you make use of the Talmud when you can use it for your purposes, and why do you reject the Talmud when it doesn't suit you? I was once a Talmudic student, too, in my younger years. As far as I understand the Talmudic law upon prohibiting mixed marriages, it is based upon

Deuteronomy. There Moses, or whoever the writer was, says, "Ye shall not intermarry with the seven nations," and he states the reason—he says they will seduce away your sons or your daughters to worship other gods. This is the reason given in the Talmudic law, the plain reason. If you discard the Talmudic law, well and good. The main question is, dare we discard the Mosaic law? If you discard it then I declare once for all, let us go over to Unitarianism and have done with it.

Rabbi Stolz—Mr. President, I want to keep very calm and see whether I understand the difference between Brother Schulman's resolution and that of the committee. As I understand it, both resolutions are opposed to intermarriage; Brother Schulman wants to prohibit a rabbi from officiating.

Rabbi Schulman—We can't prohibit anybody; we have no synodical power. All I want is to make it as strong as possible; all I said was "no rabbi ought." The little word "ought" is a strong word and refers it to ethics.

Rabbi Stolz—Mr. President, I simply want to use this opportunity in order to clarify the situation, so that we shall know what is the difference between the two resolutions. As I understand it, both of them are opposed to intermarriage per se. Dr. Schulman says no rabbi ought under any circumstances to officiate at an intermarriage; the other says the Conference is opposed to intermarriage, and it wants to leave it to the conscience of the rabbi when he has an instance before him, whether it tends to the disintegration of Judaism. Dr. Schulman's resolution, I think, will be interpreted by the rabbinate, as well as those outside, as a compulsion—under no circumstances we should; the other leaves it open when a case comes before the minister, if he is confident that eventually the non-Jewish party will come over. According to the resolution of the committee, I think the inference would be, if a case came before a rabbi and he was assured in his own mind that the non-Jew would become a Jew, or the children be reared as Jews, in that case the rabbi may make a personal decision, knowing

that always back of him is the resolution of the Conference that we are opposed to intermarriage and feel that intermarriage may result in the dissolution of our Judaism.

Rabbi Gries—Mr. President, there is one amendment before the house, that Dr. Schulman's original resolution take the place of the resolution of the committee. I amend this amendment that the resolution read as follows: "The Central Conference of American Rabbis resolves that mixed marriages are contrary to the historic tradition of the Jewish religion," and stop there. I will speak to the amendment and to the subject. Seconded.

Rabbi Gries—I want to take decided exception first to the statement of the original resolution that mixed marriages are prohibited by the Jewish religion. I am not as great a Talmudist or as learned in the law as some of the men who have spoken; I know enough of our Jewish law, the Talmudic law, the law of the Bible, and the law of later days, to know that that statement is historically incorrect. When I asked a question of Dr. Kohler, and again of Dr. Schulman, they answered me in the statement that sanction is not binding. I hold that is not a fair answer to my question. I take decided exception to that statement, "It is prohibited by the Jewish religion," because the Jewish religion does not so prohibit it. As to the statement that it is self-preservation, that likewise is not a law of the Jewish religion. As to the statement made before the Conference that we can not refuse to vote, we dare not—those who thrust this responsibility on the Conference by bringing this before us for discussion must bear the consequences. No rabbi that I know of encourages intermarriages, and when this resolution declares "and should therefore be discouraged by the American rabbinate," it implies there are some who do encourage it. Although some of you may think I am defending mixed marriages, I never have performed a marriage between Jew and non-Jew. If that be so, that is no reason why we should phrase this resolution in the words of Dr. Schulman, that "he ought not." The law of the Bible is perfectly clear—it has reference to the seven prohibited nations, and it is a

prohibition against idolatry. The position we should take, if we want to take an affirmative position, is to say that the historic position of Judaism has always been against intermarriage, and there we stand. We should not pass either resolution, and I therefore hope that my amendment will be passed.

Rabbi Jacobs—We stand for Judaism; we can't stand for any weakening of Judaism. Judaism is the purest religion on earth. There are questions of more importance—of vital importance—and the question of mixed marriage should not have been brought up, for we all feel that there is no such thing in practice as mixed marriage—it seems to be carrying coals to Newcastle—the question should not have been discussed.

Rabbi Friedlander—I come from a section of the country that is far removed from the center of Jewish activity and Jewish life. I want to tell you in all honesty and earnestness that the west has its eyes on you, gentlemen. Again and again we are asked out there in the west, "What is your opinion of the reform Rabbi?" Again and again members come to me, and non-members, saying reform Judaism is approving of mixed marriages, and so-called rabbis, characters out west, have performed mixed marriages, on the ground that reform Judaism is in favor of it. I come three thousand miles to take away a lesson from you. When I go back home they will ask me, "What is the consensus of opinion of this great American Conference?" It is necessary to carry the influence of this Conference to the furthest west, from the rising of the sun to the setting of the sun. What is the problem of this Conference? To harmonize Judaism with modern life. We want an expression from this Conference. My people away out west will ask me, "What is the sentiment in regard to mixed marriages?" You know it is the burning question of today. We do not know how to answer; give us an expression. Let me go home and say, "Here is a Conference of reform Rabbis who openly and courageously have expressed themselves against mixed marriages, and condemn the rabbi who deviates from that rule, who disregards the

sentiment of the Jews and does perform marriages which the Jews have always rejected."

Rabbi Schulman—I rise only to attempt to clarify the situation. I am opposed to the second amendment of Rabbi Gries, because to state that we declare that mixed marriages are against our traditions is to state a truism. I want to say this was not precipitated by the mover of the resolution; this Conference assigned a paper on intermarriage a year ago. If this Conference did not want to discuss the question of mixed marriage it should not have assigned the paper. I wrote a paper from my heart, therefore I am in favor of my motion, which practically means to declare to the rabbis, and thereby the younger rabbinate, that the sentiment of the Central Conference of American Rabbis is that no rabbi ought to officiate at such a marriage without conversion. Furthermore, I wish to say this, that it is not binding on the individual; we have no synodical power. A Conference that is never able to express the sentiment of the majority has not the courage of its convictions. I hope my resolution will be carried—if not carried, I will take the next best thing, the statement of the committee. I hope we will have some statement against mixed marriages.

Rabbi Enelow—Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make a speech on the subject of mixed marriages. I have said what I had to say on mixed marriages at other times and in other places. I wish to say, as far as I personally am concerned, that I tried to eliminate myself completely from the consideration of this question. When it was considered in the committee room I felt like one of the speakers who spoke here this afternoon, it would have been far better after the papers had been presented, both fine, and which in their conclusions differ very radically, I felt it would have been best to leave the papers as they were and dispose of the matter in that manner. But when this resolution was introduced and referred to the Committee on Resolutions, we all felt it became our duty to act on the resolution, and act in such a manner as would be creditable to the whole Conference and satisfactory to the community at large. It then

became necessary for the members of the committee to take counsel together and consider the question in all its serious phases, and give such an answer to the questions propounded as would be satisfactory to all persons concerned. What was there to do under the circumstances? The committee introduced the resolution which was presented this afternoon as against the resolution as presented by the original mover of the resolution for the following reason: The original resolution—I almost know it by heart—says, “Resolved, That it is the sense of this Conference that a rabbi ought not to officiate at a marriage between a Jew or Jewess and a person professing a religion other than Judaism, inasmuch as such mixed marriage is prohibited by the Jewish religion, and would tend to disintegrate the religion of Israel.” Aside from the fact that there is some redundancy in this resolution, we must remember that when this Conference passes such a resolution it is not a statement coming from an irresponsible or careless writer, but we place upon it the dignity of our Conference. When we say, because such marriages are prohibited by the Jewish religion, we lay down a dogma. I have no objection per se to the laying down of dogmas; I am not speaking on that subject; but the fact is, if we approve of this resolution we do lay down a dogma. And what does a dogma mean, if it means anything at all? It means whenever such a mixed marriage is solemnized by a rabbi, a dogma sanctioned by the wisdom of this Conference has been broken by the rabbi in question. It means another thing, and that is that such a marriage contracted by two people becomes illegitimate from the point of view of the Jewish religion. That is the way I interpret a dogma. That was the view taken by your Committee on Resolutions. If you say such marriages are absolutely prohibited by the Jewish religion, and you will all admit that the reason for adopting this resolution is to give expression to the world at large, it will happen that if women who have contracted such marriages read that on the authority of the Central Conference of American Rabbis such mixed marriage is prohibited by the Jewish religion, they would have a right

to conclude that from the point of view of the Jewish religion their marriage was not sanctioned by the religion or by the spirit of Judaism. This is the reason we changed the original resolution. We do not want to say mixed marriage is prohibited. We want to meet on the common ground where we all stand together, that is, mixed marriages are contrary to the traditions of Judaism and therefore we do not encourage them. That satisfies the gentleman who believes he ought to decide against such marriages, and satisfies the rabbis who from time to time are called on to officiate at mixed marriages.

The amendment of Rabbi Gries was put and lost.

The original motion of Rabbi Schulman was put and lost by a vote of 18 to 28.

The resolution, as framed by the committee, was adopted by a vote of 42 to 2.

The report of the Committee on Resolutions as amended was adopted as a whole.

The report of the Committee on Summer Congregations was received and adopted.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SUMMER CONGREGATIONS.

To the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Your Committee on Summer Congregations begs leave to report that the task of organizing congregations at Summer Resorts, is properly, the work of the Board of Synagog Extension. The Conference of Rabbis may extend to this Board of Synagog Extension its help in furnishing rabbis for such summer congregations. During the year past, since the appointment of this committee, the Board of Managers has been without a Director of Synagog Extensions. Under these circumstances, your committee is compelled to report that no work has been done.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE ZEPIN, *Chairman.*

TOBIAS SCHANFARBER.

WM. H. FINESHRIER.

Rabbi Foster—In keeping with practical recommendations which I made this morning in my paper, I would bring them formally to your notice. The first is, that this Conference sug-

gests to all the Jewish periodicals of this country, the advisability of printing news concerning Jewish workingmen. Adopted.

Rabbi Foster—In order that this great section shall be properly ministered to by a rabbi representing our Conference, I move that this Conference recommend to the Union of American Hebrew Congregations to place one of its rabbis in this district.

Rabbi Gries—I am in sympathy with the purpose of Rabbi Foster, but am not sure that the method he has suggested is the best plan. I therefore move that the recommendation be referred to the Executive Committee.

This motion was seconded and carried.

Rabbi Foster—In order that the rabbis themselves shall be informed of the various aspects of this great problem, I move that a permanent committee of seven, called Committee on Jewish Statistics, be appointed with power to send out pamphlets from time to time.

This was on motion referred to the Executive Committee.

Rabbi Foster—I move that the Executive Committee look into the advisability of printing at once, or in the near future, a tract in Yiddish on the relation of the synagog to the workingman, and distribute it in this section of New York City.

Carried.

Rabbi Foster—In order to make a chain that perhaps will not be broken, I move that the Executive Committee consider the advisability of recommending to the Hebrew Union College, through its Faculty and Board of Governors, the advisability of having lectures each year on industrial conditions.

Rabbi Kohler—I second it, with the statement that the beginnings of this movement have already been made.

Rabbi Levi—I amend, not to specify the theological institution, but to read, "the theological institutions of America."

The amendment was accepted by the mover.

Carried.

The Chair—In the press of our business we have overlooked the fact that two papers were left over from last Friday.

It was voted that they be made a part of the work of the next Conference.

Rabbi Sadler—In the excellent report submitted by Dr. Deutsch to the Conference, congratulations and greetings of fellowship were to be sent to the Verein für das Liberale Judentum, and also to the gentlemen in St. Petersburg. Inadvertently the name of the founder of the French society, L'Union Israelite Liberale, was omitted. This is very important, inasmuch as the eyes of European Jewry are upon us, and they want encouragement from us.

The Chair—It is moved and seconded that the Executive Committee of the Conference draw up some form of greeting to the Union Israelite Liberale of Paris. The same thing should have been done for the Jewish Religious Union of London and the Reform Congregation of St. Petersburg.

The mover included these in his motion. Carried.

Rabbi Kohler—Inasmuch as the proceedings of the Pittsburg Conference of 1885 are not accessible except through "The Jewish Reformer," a paper that is little known, and inasmuch as our Conference is based upon the proceedings or the resolutions of the Pittsburg Conference, I move that the next yearbook contain the proceedings of the Pittsburg Conference.

On motion of Rabbi Stolz, seconded and carried, this was referred to the Executive Committee.

Rabbi Calisch—In view of the fact that very many valuable papers have been published in the yearbook from time to time, and in view of the fact that the next yearbook will be the twentieth, I move that the editors provide for an index for the last ten years, and that every five years hereafter an index be made.

This was referred to the Executive Committee.

Rabbi Gries—In view of the celebrations we are having in the Jewish world, I think that for the sake of clearness of thought and knowledge of the development of the important questions

arising in our conferences, it would be very valuable if we had before us a reference book of the decisions of all rabbinical conferences.

The Chair—You have this in the first yearbook.

Rabbi Gries—There we have a collection of the decisions; what I would like to have is a reference book. Take, for example, the question of intermarriage; there are opinions and resolutions in past years that I would like to have. I move that this likewise be referred to the Executive Committee. Carried.

Rabbi Stolz—In speaking of a certificate of conversion we omitted another thing in the same connection. At the time we adopted that suggestion we also adopted the resolution to keep a record of all the cases of conversion that occurred in this country. No such record has been kept, no book has been prepared; I move that this matter be referred to the Executive Committee. Carried.

The Chair—Now, gentlemen, in the matter of the meeting place for the next Conference, we have invitations from San Francisco, Toledo, Rochester and Atlantic City.

It was moved that the matter of the next place of meeting be referred to the Executive Committee.

Rabbi Morgenstern—I amend the motion that it be the sense of this Conference that the next meeting shall be held in some resort, centrally located and easily accessible, if such can be found.

Rabbi Gries—I would like to speak in reference to the place of meeting. The two years previous to this Conference we met in a place away from a city, and under favorable conditions for work, and this year, for special reasons, we met at a different season of the year and in the great city of New York. I do not believe we should pass any motion now which binds us to a place, but I think the intention of Dr. Morgenstern should be carried out. There should be an informal expression of opinion

as to whether we should meet in a place like Frankfort or in a city.

The vote taken revealed that the sentiment of the Conference was overwhelmingly in favor of holding the next convention in some suitable summer resort in preference to some city.

Rabbi Morgenstern—Inasmuch as we have received these invitations from different places, I move that the Corresponding Secretary be instructed to acknowledge the invitations. Carried.

The report of the Committee on Thanks was presented by its Chairman, Rabbi S. Hirshberg, and was on motion adopted by a rising vote.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THANKS.

The Twentieth Convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis has been a memorable one in a number of respects. It has been and will remain particularly memorable, in the agreeable recollection of its members, for the many amiable and generous courtesies and attentions accorded them during their stay in this city. The members will carry away with them, an especial sense of appreciation and gratitude toward Temples Emanu-El and Beth-El and the Educational Alliance for so hospitably placing at their disposal their assembly rooms for the meetings of the Conference; toward Professor Loeb and Mr. Nathaniel Myer, for making so cozy and pleasant their visit to the splendid educational and philanthropic institutions of this city, by providing for their conveyance in automobiles; toward Mr. William Williams, Commissioner of Immigration, for the courtesies amidst the pressure of his official duties, personally shown by him, to them, at Ellis Island; toward Messrs. Klaw and Erlanger and Frederic Thompson, for the dramatic entertainment with which they regaled them; toward Mr. and Mrs. Jacob H. Schiff and the Judeans, for the pleasant opportunities for social intercourse they so thoughtfully afforded them in their delightful receptions; toward the six congregations, Emanu-El, Beth-El, Israel of Harlem, Israel of Brooklyn, Rodeph Shalom, and Ahavath Chesed-Shaar Hashamayim, for the delectable midday repasts and the royal Lucullan banquet with which they supplemented the less substantial fare of the feast of reason at the Conference sessions; and finally toward Mr. Solomon Sulzburger and the members of the local Committee on Arrangements, who, with so much cost in thought, time and effort, arranged and carried through to such perfect success, this rare and varied programme, for the entertainment of the members of the Con-

ference. To each and to all of these, in expression of the profound sense of obligation of the members of the Conference, the Committee on Thanks would, with this—as a resolution offered—call upon the members of the Conference to rise and testify to their most cordial appreciation of all these kindnesses received.

Respectfully submitted,

ABRAM BRILL.
DAVID ALEXANDER.
FELIX A. LEVY.
WILLIAM H. GREENBURG.
CHARLES FLEISCHER.
J. H. LANDAU.
SIMON R. COHEN.
SAMUEL HIRSHBERG, *Chairman*.

The Chair—Gentlemen of the Conference, the closing hour is nigh. Before the closing prayer by the Honorary President the order of business would be the induction of the new President into office. To our great regret, both because of his personal absence and the cause that keeps him away, Rabbi Heller is not here. Before asking the new Vice-President to say a word in assuming his office, I wish to express to you, members and colleagues of this Conference, my appreciation of your consideration for the Chair during the trying moments of this meeting, and my hope that this great convention in New York will redound not only to the honor of our Conference and the benefit of our members, but also to the good of the great body of Jews in this metropolis and in this country. And now, gentlemen of the Conference, in the absence of the new President, it gives me very great pleasure to introduce your new Vice-President.

The Vice-President took the Chair.

Rabbi Levi—Mr. Chairman, before the new administration begins its work, I would suggest that the Conference by a rising vote indicate to our retiring President its sense of appreciation of the fairness, courtesy, and wisdom with which he has presided over the deliberations of this the Twentieth Annual Conference of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and for all the

administrative services, which he has performed so well and so satisfactorily, during his tenure in office.

This was done by a rising vote.

After a few words by Rabbi Schulman in accepting his office, and closing prayer and benediction by the Honorary President, Rabbi Kohler, the Conference adjourned *sine die*.

SUMMARY.

Ninety-seven members in attendance, the largest number present at any Conference.

Memorial paper read and memorial exercises held in honor of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of David Einhorn.

Tribute paid to the memory of Joseph Mayor Asher.

Memorial paper in honor of Adolph Radin.

Former method of dividing interest on all investments of Conference money equally between General and Relief Funds reintroduced.

Scriptural readings referred to Executive Committee to report upon at next Conference.

Memorial resolutions in honor of Meier Friedman, David Woolf Marks, Gustav Karpeles, Moses Bloch, Baron Horace de Guenzburg, Jacob Gordin, Joseph Leicester Lyne (Father Ignatius), Theodore Barth and Theodore Haase, adopted.

Communications of congratulation and fellowship ordered sent to the Society for Liberal Judaism in Germany, Mr. Claude G. Montefiore in London, Mr. Isaac Jacobs in Melbourne, Australia, and Mr. N. Pereferkovitch in St. Petersburg.

Committee on Revision of Union Hymnal reports considerable progress and outlines the principles that should underlie the work of revision, all of which, with a few minor modifications, are adopted by the Conference.

Recommendation of Committee on Church and State that the next Conference Tract be on the subject, "From a Constitutional Standpoint This is not a Christian Country," referred to Executive Committee.

Committee on Church and State charged with duty of preparing short accounts of each of the holidays, which with additions of local interest are to be sent by each rabbi to the local press.

The matter of the caricature of the Jew on stage and in current publications likewise referred to Committee on Church and State.

A message of "affectionate greeting" from the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of New York received, to which the Conference responded by a message of appreciation.

Committee on Sermonic Literature instructed to devise ways and means for a wider and more efficient distribution of the annual sermonic pamphlets, and report at next Conference.

Lyceum Bureau Committee authorized to include in its prospectus notice of lectures by laymen upon Jewish topics.

A fee of one dollar per person fixed for registration with the Lyceum Bureau Committee.

Determined that at next Conference, Religious School Day be devoted to a consideration of special work for confirmation classes.

Preparation of a Sabbath-School Transfer Card, to be furnished upon request to members of the Conference, ordered.

Taking of a census of Jewish children of school age, the plan and necessary expenditure for which are subject to approval of Executive Committee, authorized.

Committee on Religious Schools instructed to present an annual report concerning the state of Jewish religious education throughout the country, including a census of its extent and a study of the standards and methods of our schools.

Committee on Religious Schools empowered to urge, and perhaps arrange for, the reprint of illustrations in the Jewish Encyclopedia and other publications which have value for the teaching of Jewish subjects.

Rising vote of thanks and appreciation extended to Mr. Jacob Schiff for his generosity in establishing teachers' colleges to further the cause of Jewish religious education.

A correspondence course for religious school teachers urged.

A permanent exhibit of religious school material, to be displayed annually at the sessions of the Conference, and during the year to be kept in charge of, and loaned for display by, the Executive Committee, ordered.

Committee on Social and Religious Union instructed to distribute a reprint of its report among the congregations.

Members of the Conference urged to make special efforts to satisfy the religious and spiritual needs of defectives and delinquents in their vicinity.

Advisability of arranging a special course of instruction for those Jewish deaf who desire to make religious instruction among the Jewish deaf their life work, to be suggested to the governors of the Jewish theological institutions of this country.

Action of the Conference of two years ago, urging capable Jewish men and women to prepare themselves to take charge of Jewish philanthropic and educational institutions reaffirmed.

Pamphlet of personal prayers, prepared by Committee on Domestic Service, ordered submitted to members for revision and suggestions, with a time limit of February 1, 1910, after which the Committee of Domestic Service shall proceed to the final redaction to be submitted for approval at the next Conference.

Amendment to Article III, Section I, of the Constitution, providing that professors of rabbinical seminaries, active and retired rabbis of congregations, graduates of a rabbinical seminary, and rabbis not

graduates of a rabbinical seminary who have for three consecutive years been in charge of a congregation, shall be eligible to membership in the Conference, introduced.

The plan of the Committee on Geiger Centenary for the publication of a memorial volume, approved.

The attention of all the rabbis of the country is called to the need of ministering directly to the spiritual needs of Jewish university students.

Suggestion of the President to establish a Bible Fund, approved of.

Appointment of committee to solicit contributions to Conference Tract, Relief and Bible Funds, ordered.

Resolved to secure 10,000 subscriptions to the new Bible translation.

The plan to cooperate more fully with the Board of Synagogue and School Extension of the U. A. H. C. for the inauguration of services at summer resorts, approved of.

Saturday, May 24, 1910, appointed as the Geiger Memorial Day.

"Young Israel" heartily endorsed, and the members of the Conference urged to make every possible effort for its support.

Resolved that the Conference act conjointly with the U. A. H. C. and the various Jewish Agricultural Aid Societies to satisfy the religious needs of Jewish farmers.

Appointment of a Board of Arbitration to adjudicate cases of dispute between rabbis and congregations, ordered.

Shabbas Zachor designated as the day for an appeal in behalf of the Alliance Israelite Universelle, in honor of its fiftieth anniversary.

Memorial resolutions adopted in honor of following deceased members, Adolph M. Radin, Joseph Herz, Solomon Sonnenschein and Louis Weiss, and in honor of Joseph Mayor Asher.

Resolution adopted urging the governments of the civilized world, particularly the Signatory Powers of the Berlin Treaty, to take vigorous and persevering action for the protection of Armenian Christians in Turkey and for the protection of and granting rights of citizenship to Jews in Roumania.

Appointment ordered of a committee to prepare a revised certificate of conversion, to be submitted to the next Conference for adoption.

Work of the Council of Jewish Women for purification of the press endorsed.

Resolution declaring that mixed marriages are contrary to the tradition of the Jewish religion and should therefore be discouraged by the American Rabbinate adopted by a vote of 42-2.

Decided to call the attention of the Jewish press to the advisability of printing news concerning Jewish workingmen.

A

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT, RABBI DAVID PHILIPSON, TO THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS, HELD AT NEW YORK CITY, NOVEMBER 9, 1909.

Colleagues and Friends:

Twenty years ago a life-long dream of Isaac M. Wise was realized, when in the month of July, eighteen hundred and eighty-nine, in the city of Detroit, the Central Conference of American Rabbis was organized. The seventieth birthday of the famous rabbi had been celebrated with much rejoicing a few months previously. At that time the revered teacher said to the present speaker, his pupil and youthful colleague, that he believed the time was ripe for the formation of a permanent organization of the rabbis of the United States, adding that if this were achieved it would crown the labors of his life. The result has proven that the great organizer of American Judaism was correct in his diagnosis of the situation. As in the case of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Hebrew Union College, so with the Conference this master mind builded better than possibly even he knew. A score of years is a short space in the life of an institution, but even in this brief interval our Conference has grown to be the largest rabbinical organization in the world. It has welded into an organic union the religious leaders of the liberal, or, as it is called, the reform wing of Judaism. Many men of many minds though the members of our Conference be, still are we united by the acceptance of the principle of development in Judaism, the adjustment of our religious heritage to the

growing thought and the changing conditions of the advancing years in the history of civilization. For reform does not mean simply the discarding of some traditional forms or ceremonies, as is commonly supposed; it is not merely a system of pale negations. To use David Einhorn's striking phrase, the reform movement represents a "Jewish religious transformation;" it has a positive message and its theology presents a positive program. Of this the achievements and pronouncements of our Conference give evidence. The story of these two decades of the existence of our organization is the tale of sincere endeavor to interpret the centuries message of our faith in the terms of our modern conditions and our modern environment.

Ten years ago, in recognition of the eightieth birthday of its founder, the Conference met in special session in the city of Cincinnati. From far and from near the pupils and the colleagues of America's most noted rabbi pilgrimed to do him honor. It was the last meeting of our organization over which he presided, or which he attended, for before the next session took place he was called to the *yeshibah shel maalah*. The presidential address of that year was the last message that he delivered to his colleagues; we still seem to hear the beloved voice as he uttered these pregnant sentences: "By this God-blessed organization the American rabbis were united in a bond of brotherhood; all feuds, strifes, quarrels and animosities, which raged among us for many years, vanished like fog before the sun. * * * Peace, unanimity and good-fellowship sway their golden scepter among us and in our congregations. * * * What we have learned of one another in these meetings, how we have been mutually impelled to respect and esteem one another, is perhaps known only to those who steadily attend our annual conventions. How the rabbi gained in authority and esteem of his people, how largely Judaism gained in dignity, and the congregations in peace and goodwill, mutually by this organization and its work, is certainly understood by all. Therefore, I think, it is the solemn duty

of the whole house of Israel to maintain and sustain this peace-, union- and truth-terminating body, this Central Conference of American Rabbis."

The faith of Isaac M. Wise in the possibilities of this organization never wavered. His inextinguishable optimism characterized his every utterance to the very end. He more than any other one man shaped the course of Judaism in this country; he coined the phrase, American Judaism, because he believed that in the free environment of these United States Judaism has the most congenial atmosphere wherein to develop and has, too, possibilities for growth unparalleled in its history; he believed also that this Conference was a sign and symbol of this American Judaism. Though in the latter years of his life backward forces were strongly in evidence among Jews in this country, notably in the Eastern section, yet he never permitted himself to be swept off his feet by the waves of the reactionism that were engulfing many others. He held his rudder true to the course that he had traversed all his years. In this session held in the year that marks the tenth anniversary of his last appearance as our president, let us record once again his unforgettable services in the cause that our Conference represents, the forward movement in Judaism, which discriminates between eternal values and the temporary expression of these values, between the principle of tradition and separate traditions. The Conference continues the line of Jewish *tradition*, but it evaluates *traditions* according to their power to express the message of religion to living men. If these traditions are simply survivals of an outgrown phase of Judaism they can only hinder the healthy development of the faith; if they still have power to stir religious emotion and to widen the spiritual outlook their potency as factors in the continuing strain of Jewish effort is unquestioned. The life of the people is the crucible in which the endurance of traditions is put to the test. All religious reform that is significant issues from the life of the people. Not rabbis, not theologians inaugurate reform movements, but the people. In

the nineteenth century many Jews in a new environment of freedom began to discard traditions and ceremonies that no longer were expressive of their religious outlook; this marked the birth of the reform movement; the rabbis, the theologians were simply the keen thinkers who recognized that a new movement had arisen; they gave it a name and formulated its principles. The chain of Jewish tradition was not broken, but certain Jewish traditions and ceremonies were discarded. The reform movement is just as truly a link in this chain of Jewish tradition as was the rabbinism that culminated in the *Shulchan Aruch* of the sixteenth century. The reform movement is expressive of the spirit of latter day Judaism in the free countries of the world, as was the *Shulchan Aruch* of the spirit of rabbinic Judaism in the ghettos of mediaeval Europe. In this line of tradition our Conference, as interpretative of the religious life of a large section of American Jews, stands; our modern life spells the tradition that has descended to us from our storied past in the terms of the living present and shapes that tradition accordingly, removing here, retaining there, changing here, continuing there, re-interpreting here, adding there. Tradition continues, traditions arise and pass. This vital distinction the great reformers who lived in the stirring days of the birth of a new time recognized and gave voice to; their pioneer work we are continuing here in this Conference, adapting the spirit of Jewish tradition to the problems of our own time, building as best we can for the future and recognizing our debt to the generations past to whom we are linked by the indissoluble bond of our spiritual heritage.

Foremost among these pioneers in the van of the liberal movement in Judaism were the two men, the centenaries of whose birth fall this year, and whose memories we will honor by special exercises during this session, David Einhorn and Samuel Adler, of blessed memory. Both these men were in the thick of the exciting struggles of the early years of the reform movement; both were among the most prominent fig-

ures in the famous German rabbinical conferences of the fifth decade of the nineteenth century, where many of the religious problems called forth in Jewry by the new spirit of a new age were debated for the first time in a public forum by Jewish leaders; both after varied experiences in European congregations followed the call to this country, where as leaders of large and influential congregations they stood foremost among the guides of Jewish public opinion. David Einhorn, the preacher of prophetic eloquence and the reformer of dauntless courage, had joined the choir invisible of the great immortal spirits ten years before our Conference was organized, but Samuel Adler, the quiet scholar, and the only survivor in this country of those who had participated in the reform conferences of Germany, was elected honorary president of this organization. He was the living symbol of the bond connecting our body with those noted gatherings, an intimate connection with which was declared in a resolution adopted at our first convention, which announced "that the proceedings of all the modern rabbinical conferences from that held in Brunswick in 1844, and including all like assemblages held since, shall be taken as a basis for the work of this Conference in an endeavor to maintain in unbroken historic succession the formulated expression of Jewish life and thought of each era."

By thus honoring the memory of these famed exponents of the message of progressive Judaism we emphasize anew the principle which they and their great contemporaries expressed in an hundred and one ways, that the revelation of God is continuous and that the dead forms of religion must drop piecemeal into the dust if the living spirit of religion is to continue to bring blessing to men.

Now, no one who is not wilfully blind can blink the fact that the interpretation of Judaism as taught by the reformers is being put to the test today as never before in this country, and notably in this metropolis, with its Jewish population greater in number than has ever been gathered in one city

anywhere. Up to a quarter of a century ago the reformed Jewish congregations were in the great majority in the United States; today owing to the tide of immigration from Eastern Europe that has been sweeping to these shores during the past two decades this is no longer the case. But this state of affairs is only temporary. Although the interpretation of Judaism that obtains in the Russian Pale of Settlement, in Galicia and in Roumania has been transplanted hither it can not and will not thrive in the free atmosphere of this country. The older generation that grew up under its influence continues the observance of the religion as of yore, but the younger generation educated in American schools and reared in the American environment is drifting away from the faith as practiced by their fathers. So called orthodoxy does not and can not hold them. The progressive spirit is in the American atmosphere and invades the religious as well as every other province. If religion barricades itself behind the walls of the sixteenth century so much the worse for religion. The twentieth century generation will pass it by. That there is a crisis in our religious situation owing to the lack of sympathy between the older European generation recently transplanted to this soil and their children, the younger American generation reared and born here, there can be no manner of doubt. In this crisis reform Judaism has once again a great opportunity. Undoubtedly, to meet the new situation different practical methods will have to be employed from those used sixty years ago, when the German immigrants organized their reform congregations, for the situation is much more complex and new factors have been injected into the general religious and the particular Jewish outlook. But whatever the practical methods, they will be along the forward line of progressiveness, not along the backward march of reactionism. No sentimental romanticism, no hazy obscurantism, no artificial mediaevalism can prevent the eventual triumph of the liberal movement, however much they may seem to retard it momentarily. In a greater or less degree the reform principles must be

adopted if Judaism is to thrive and prosper in this land of free institutions and progressive endeavor. If Judaism is to be more than a mere survival from a great past, if it is to be a living religion and bring a living message to this generation, it must express itself in terms and forms consonant with living needs and living hopes. I have the firm faith that from out of all the confusion of our present situation, caused by the clashing of the outlived old with the living new, there will issue peace and progress; I have the firm faith that our new citizenship, which is the present storm center of the American Jewish world, will work hand in hand with the older elements of the Jewish population of this our country in the evolving of a form of the message of Judaism, which, combining the reverential spirit for all that is fine in our great past with the forward vision of our prophetic inheritance, shall on this free soil make the great truths of God and man, of duty and destiny, of life and eternity, of social justice and individual righteousness as interpreted by Jewish thought, vital in practice and honored in the observance.

I have the firm faith that this aspect of Judaism, universal in its teaching, will accentuate the great underlying everlasting fact that is the significant feature of our gathering here, the religious note, the religious significance of the Jew's place in the world.

For when all is said and done this remains as the decisive factor in the life of the Jew and Judaism. Discussion varied and heated is playing about the problem of the Jew and Judaism in many quarters. Out of all the Babel of conflicting views one word issues clear and unmistakable and that word is this: whatever Judaism may or may not be it is a religion; whatever the Jew may or may not be he is primarily a member of a religious community. Eliminate the religious content from the story of Judaism and the Jew in the world and this becomes in all truth an idiot tale, signifying nothing. Try to imagine if you can an atheistic Judaism; an atheistic Judaism, truly a contradiction in terms, truly an

unthinkable paradox. And yet in these days of ours there are individuals posing as Jewish leaders, and many of their followers who would reduce the religious element to the vanishing point and make of Judaism a policy of statecraft, a racial aggregate, a charity organization society, or what not. We here in this convention assembled, however else we may interpret the side issues that combine in making up the Jewish composite agree in the religious connotation of the terms Jew and Judaism. This meeting is a demonstration of that supreme fact. If Judaism as Judaism, and the Jew as Jew, have given any specific or unique gift to the world it has been in the religious province, for Judaism as Judaism and the Jew as Jew represent a certain religious interpretation of the universe and life; if Judaism as Judaism and the Jew as Jew have still an object of existence and are to make any further contribution to a solution of the problems of society it will be along the line of the Jewish religious interpretation of the facts of life. Jewish life today in this country and elsewhere, in this great city and other large centers of population is presenting many perplexities and difficulties. It is anomalous, is it not, that the religious touchstone is applied so infrequently to the sore spots? That men who pass as representative Jews in many communities have no religious affiliation or take slight interest in religious affairs? This growing divorce between religion and life may indeed give us pause. I take it that there is no more important task for the religious guides of Jewry than the annulment of that divorce and the re-marriage of religion and life. To bring the religion into touch with modern life is one of the purposes of the reform movement; to bring the religion into touch with the problems of our present situation must be the purpose of Jewish leaders today, be their leaning to reform or orthodoxy, to radicalism or conservatism. On this broad religious basis we all stand united, whatever be our individual sympathies. In this spirit let us deliberate here; we shall approach from the religious side the many questions that will arise for our consideration; ours it is

to accentuate the supremacy of the religious factor in the strivings of Judaism and the endeavor of the Jew; long ago the Deuteronomist declared that Israel's separatism from other peoples was due to its election by God to be the people of religion; all of Israel's history is a commentary on that statement; if this conception seems to be suffering a temporary eclipse in these days, ours it is to arouse the attention of Israel to it anew; ours it is to give it decided expression. Thus may we go forward in God's name and with God's help!

THE PAST YEAR.

Since last we met the Conference has pursued the work mapped out by our last convention through its various committees. The Conference has kept in touch with the congregations by occasional communications addressed to them by the Executive officers. One of these communications resulted in contributions being made by a number of congregations to assist the work of preparing and distributing tracts free. These congregations were Adath Israel, Louisville, Ky.; Adath Israel, Lexington, Ky.; Bene Israël, Cincinnati; Beth El, New York; Beth El, Detroit, Mich.; Beth Ahaba, Richmond, Va.; Beth Israel, Hartford, Conn.; Emanuel, Dallas, Texas; First Hebrew, Oakland, Cal.; Indianapolis Hebrew, Indianapolis, Ind.; Israel, Omaha, Neb.; Keneseth Israel, Philadelphia, Pa.; Sinai, New Orleans, La. Contributions to this fund were received also from District No. 4, I. O. B. B., Rev. Dr. S. Wolfenstein, of Cleveland, and Messrs. L. & A. Keiser, of Buffalo. These tracts have been widely distributed. During the past year a second edition of ten thousand copies of the tract, "What Do Jews Believe?" by Rabbi H. G. Enelow, was printed and a new tract on "The Jew in America," by Rabbi David Philipson, was issued; of this new tract twenty thousand copies were printed. A new edition of the Union Prayer Book, comprising five thousand copies of part one and five thousand copies of

part two, was issued; likewise an edition of seven thousand copies of the smaller book, Sabbath Morning and Evening Services. An edition of two thousand copies of the Union Hymnal was printed.

The Year Book of three hundred and forty-eight pages was published, the work of editing being done by our competent secretaries. The papers, "Samson Raphael Hirsch," by Rabbi Max Heller; "The Significance of the Bible for Reform Judaism in the Light of Modern Scientific Research," by Rabbi Julian Morgenstern and "Crescas and Spinoza," by Professor David Neumark, were issued as separate reprints.

Through its Committee on Sermonic Literature the Conference issued a set of holiday sermons for free distribution to congregations or communities that having no rabbi desire to conduct services on the high holidays. This volume includes sermons by our members, Rabbis Samuel Schulman, George Solomon, Nathan Krass, Seymour G. Bottigheimer, Adolph Guttmacher and Joseph S. Kornfeld.

Three thousand five hundred and forty-four copies of Volume I and five thousand and forty-seven copies of Volume II of the Union Prayer Book, two thousand five hundred and ninety-seven copies of the Union Hymnal and one thousand one hundred and twenty-six copies of the Union Haggadah were sold. The Union Prayer Book was introduced by fourteen new congregations, so that this ritual is now used by two hundred and seventy-eight congregations.

The custom of donating prayer books and other publications to philanthropic and correctional institutions that make application for these books has been continued. Such donations have been made during the past year to the following institutions: the New Jersey State Prison, the Boys' Protectory at Hawthorne, New York; the Home for Jewish Friendless, Chicago; the Eastern New York Reformatory, the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital, the Jewish Orphan Asylum, Newark, New Jersey; the Jewish Orphan Asylum, Chicago; the Jewish Orphan's Home, Los Angeles, Cal.; the Hebrew Institute, Chicago; the Union

of American Hebrew Congregations for synagogue extension work in Mexico City.

THE BIBLE TRANSLATION.

At the last meeting of the Conference your president's recommendation that the Conference join with the Jewish Publication Society of America in the work of preparing an English translation of the Bible was adopted. The Executive Committee, to whom was referred the task of naming the three representatives of the Conference on the editorial board, elected as these representatives: Rabbis K. Kohler, Samuel Schulman and David Philipson. The Publication Society named as its representatives Professor S. Schechter, Dr. Cyrus Adler and Dr. Joseph Jacobs. The six determined upon Professor Max L. Margolis as Editor in Chief. The Editorial board has had a number of sessions during the past year and has made good progress in the work. The Board will continue to meet until the work of translation and revision will be completed. This joint work undertaken by the representatives of the two schools of Jewish thought in the United States, the progressive and the conservative, is an auspicious sign of the possibility of union in Israel in the broad tasks that rise above the level of conflicting opinions and theories.

The task of translating the Bible is preliminary to the publication of the work when finished. Our Conference has incurred no responsibility in the matter of furnishing the means for the publication of the work. However, funds for this work of publication must be forthcoming. The new English translation of the Bible should be sold at a nominal cost. To make this possible a large fund is necessary for the initial publication. We, as the religious leaders of our respective communities, are especially interested in having the Bible well printed at a moderate price. A project is now on foot to secure a fund for the publication of the Bible. Several public spirited individuals have signified their willingness to contribute generously

to this fund. Every community should join in the work of creating a Jewish Bible Fund. There is no organization to which this appeals more than to ours or within whose scope it lies more properly. Although our treasury is not plethoric enough for us to vote a contribution for this purpose, still, either through the Executive Committee or a special committee to be appointed, we can propose some plan whereby this matter shall be brought to the attention of our congregations and communities through our members. I recommend that some such action be taken whereby our members be urged through the instrumentality of a Conference committee to join with the properly constituted agency on Bible Fund emanating from the Jewish Publication Society in doing what they can towards securing contributions to a fund for the publication and distribution of our new English translation of the Bible.

SERVICES AT SUMMER RESORTS.

One of the results of our two meetings at the summer resort Frankfort, Michigan, in the summers of nineteen hundred and seven and eight, was the establishment of a weekly religious service. Similar services were held at this same resort during the past summer by the lay members of the summer colony. This suggests a manner in which this question of the holding of religious services during the summer months at resorts visited by large numbers of our co-religionists can be solved. If these services are inaugurated by a rabbi there will undoubtedly be found everywhere as at Frankfort interested laymen who will continue the work, reading the services themselves, furnishing the music and the like. With this thought in mind I requested the privilege of attending a meeting a few months ago of the Board of Synagogue and School Extension of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. I laid this matter before the members of that Board and suggested that here was an enterprise in which their Board and the Conference can work hand

in hand. A resolution was adopted at that meeting to the effect that the Board of Synagogue and School Extension stands ready to join with the Central Conference of American Rabbis in establishing religious services at summer resorts where there are no congregations and where no provision is made for such services; that Board will furnish the funds necessary within a reasonable limit if the Conference will assist in the work of establishing the services. My recommendation, therefore, is that our Committee on Divine Services at Summer Resorts shall co-operate with the Board of School and Synagogue Extension of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in the work. The details of plans to carry this work to a successful consummation can be left to this committee and a similar committee of the Board in question or its Director of School and Synagogue work.

TRACT FUND.

The free distribution of tracts by the Conference has been acclaimed in many quarters as one of the most praiseworthy achievements of our organization. The work of the tract committee has been hampered greatly for lack of funds. Many more tracts would have been issued, and far more of the two already issued would have been printed and distributed had the money for this work been available. The contributions by a number of congregations and individuals, as noted above, towards the furtherance of this work suggests the possibility of the establishment of a Tract Fund. This work appeals to many of our co-religionists throughout the land, and undoubtedly, if the work be undertaken with vigor, goodly sums will be contributed to such a fund. This is work in which the Conference should have, and without question has, the sympathy of hundreds of our co-religionists; it is missionary work in the cause of Judaism. I would recommend that the incoming Executive Committee be instructed to put forth special efforts towards bringing to the attention of congregations and individuals the

desire of the Conference to establish a Tract Fund for the purpose of extending the work already inaugurated of publishing and distributing far and wide tracts on subjects appertaining to Judaism and the Jew.

THE GEIGER CENTENARY.

On May 24 next, occurs the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Geiger, the foremost figure in the history of the progressive movement in Judaism. Our conference has already made provision for the recognition of this event by a resolution adopted some time ago to publish a Geiger memorial volume. The committee to whom this task has been entrusted will report in the course of our deliberations during this week. However, appropriate as the publication of a volume in celebration of the centenary will be, it appears that our Conference should take further note of the event. It is not likely that we will be able to hold a meeting on that day, falling as it does shortly before the Feast of Weeks when we are all busily engaged with preparations for the confirmation service; hence the only other manner of officially marking the day is to celebrate it in all our congregations by having discourses preached on the life and work of Abraham Geiger. I recommend that the Conference designate Saturday, May 21, as Geiger Day, and that four weeks before that date the Executive Committee address a communication to our members, requesting them to devote their sermons on that Sabbath or on the following day, Sunday, May 22, to memorializing this great leader whose name looms so large on the horizon of modern Judaism.

YOUNG ISRAEL.

At our Indianapolis convention three years ago, the subject of a juvenile journal for Jewish children was thoroughly

discussed and the sympathy of the Conference with the project was made evident by a vote authorizing the Executive Committee to grant a subvention to such a journal in case of its being established under the auspices of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Many of our members pledged their personal support to the extent that they would introduce the journal into their religious schools. The publication of the journal *Young Israel* was begun in due time. For nearly two years, first at Detroit and then at Cincinnati, it was edited by a Board of Editors chosen by the Board of School and Synagogue Extension of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and consisting for the most part of members of this Conference. Since May last the editorial management has been vested in one editor, Dr. Julian Morgenstern, our capable colleague and corresponding secretary. Both the former publisher, Mr. Sol Goldsmith, of Detroit, and the present publisher, Mr. S. Bacharach, of Cincinnati, have been keenly disappointed in the failure of our members to support this paper as they had a right to expect from the assurances that had been given. The publisher informs me that the subscriptions to the journal come chiefly from quarters not influenced by members of the Conference. It is quite true that this publication is not perfect; it is quite possible that it does not come up to the standard that individual rabbis have set for such a journal; but in that case enough interest should have been evinced by our members to indicate to the editor or the publisher in what particulars the paper was lacking; the indifference and even hostility to the paper by members of this Conference was unlooked for. The Conference through its members is morally responsible to lend assistance to the publisher of the paper; its publication was undertaken only after the Conference had endorsed it and many of our members had pledged their support and encouragement. We have therefore an obligation to discharge in the premises. If the journal is not satisfactory let the statements as to where it fails be frankly and kindly made, but let the discouraging indifference that has marked the attitude of so many of our

members cease. The paper will be able to succeed as it should only if the rabbis will give it support and encouragement.

RELIGIOUS SERVICES FOR FARMING COMMUNITIES.

The recent agricultural exhibit in this city of the products raised by Jewish farmers was a revelation to many. Throughout this country there are now communities of Jews engaged in agricultural pursuits. Many of us see here the solution of the economic problems resulting from the congestion in the so-called ghettos of our great cities. The more successful that our agricultural and colonization societies are in their efforts in inducing our co-religionists to leave crowded city quarters and take up their habitation on farms the more will diminish the misery and wretchedness that are taxing our charitable organizations in New York and elsewhere to the utmost. The farming communities already in existence present a religious problem which is of especial interest to us as a rabbinical conference. The matter was brought to my attention by our fellow member, Rabbi A. R. Levi, of Chicago, who has given many years of earnest work to this cause. A number of farming communities are far from any Jewish center. The children grow up without religious instruction or religious influences. It is rarely that religious services are held. It is altogether likely that unless this matter be taken in hand that in time these communities will drift altogether without the pale of Judaism. These communities should be visited at regular intervals by a rabbi or teacher appointed for that purpose. The Conference should take the initiative in this matter. We should bring it to the attention of our various agricultural and colonization societies. It is possible that by the co-operation of the Conference with these various organizations some working arrangement can be reached whereby a rabbi to the colonies will be appointed and the Jewish farmers in the distant West and South that are now far removed from town or city will be brought within the cir-

cle of organized religious effort. Our Conference as a representative organization of America's Jewish religious life must keep in touch with all movements that make for the uplift of the Jew in the American environment.

THE WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC.

Whatever may be the attitude of individual rabbis towards the so-called institutional synagogue, some favoring the introduction of social, athletic, industrial and other features into the synagogue and others taking the opposite stand, still all agree that the synagogue as the official exponent of Judaism must take a hand in every movement concerned with the betterment of the life of the Jew if religion is to be an active influence and not merely a matter of ritualistic observance. Notably must this be the case in all matters appertaining to the moral life of the community. The Jewish world has been stirred from center to circumference by the recent disclosures of the part Jews have played in the pursuance of the white slave traffic. Though there be many non-Jews engaged in this nefarious business, still that there should be any Jews whatsoever concerned in these well nigh incredible transactions is so at variance with our traditions that it had been strange indeed if this *chilul hashem* had not called forth a cry of horror and condemnation from many places. In Turkey the new chief rabbi, Haim Nahoum, has taken steps towards putting a stop to the horrible traffic; in England Dr. Hermann Adler, the chief rabbi, denounced scathingly at a great public meeting the miscreants who, Jews in name but not in faith, are the very scum of humanity; in Chicago a number of our own members in conjunction with public spirited Jewish laymen of that community are now sharing in a campaign for the stamping out of this evil and the vindication of the Jewish name. The chastity of the Jewish woman and the purity of the Jewish home are among our most cherished legacies. The evil, it appears, has spread to many of our

cities. It must be met and battled with everywhere as is now being done in Chicago. Who more than the synagogues through the rabbis should be in the van of a movement like this? Societies are being organized for the suppression of the white slave traffic. Jewish girls are but too frequently the victims, Jewish men among the panders to vice; our Conference, while expressing its horror at this state of affairs, must also join with all other good agencies, nay, should be at the very forefront in condemning and combatting this unspeakable evil.

A BOARD OF ARBITRATION.

During the past year two communications were addressed to me as president of the Conference by officers of congregations complaining of the unfair treatment meted out to the congregation by rabbis and asking whether there was not some means whereby the congregation could gain justice. Without doubt there are instances also wherein rabbis have like grievances against congregations. Now, although our congregations are autonomous and the Conference never has presumed and would not presume to interfere in any way with the internal management of any congregation's affairs, still in view of the state of affairs disclosed by these two communications it would appear advisable to have a Board of Arbitration consisting of three members appointed by this Conference and three members appointed by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, before whom any dispute between congregation and rabbi may be brought for arbitration if a congregation on the one hand or a rabbi on the other, or both, so desire. As a matter of course this Board could have no power other than advisory, but it might prove the means of securing fair treatment for the aggrieved party, be it the congregation or the rabbi, and the very existence of such a Board may prevent such occurrences as the two to which reference has been made.

THE ALLIANCE ISRAELITE UNIVERSELLE.

The first of the great Jewish agencies of an international character to be established in the nineteenth century for the uplift of the Jews in the backward countries of Asia, Africa and Eastern Europe was the *Alliance Israelite Universelle*. Whatever mistakes of policy this organization may have made (all human works are fallible) still there can be no manner of doubt that through the schools it has established it has done much good and for this reason deserves the encouragement of all who are interested in the welfare of Jewry. This organization founded in eighteen hundred and sixty by a band of noble spirited French Jews will celebrate its golden jubilee during the coming year. This event is of sufficient import to be taken note of by Jews everywhere. It would be a graceful recognition on the part of our Conference of the work of this great Jewish educational organization were our members to devote the sermon on a certain Sabbath to the work of and an appeal for the Alliance. In a number of congregations it has been the custom for many years past to take up a collection for the Alliance on the Sabbath preceding Purim. This being the case it would appear appropriate for the Conference to designate for this purpose the Sabbath which will fall on the nineteenth of March and to instruct the incoming Executive Committee to request all our members to present the work and the claims of the Alliance on that day.

DEATHS DURING THE YEAR.

The passing years are depleting the ranks. During the interval since last we met the hand of death has removed from our midst four of our members. We record here our appreciation of their services in their various communities, our sympathy with their families and our gratitude for whatever aid they may have rendered in the work of our Conference. Of Solomon H. Sonne-

schein let us recall only the brilliant promise of his early career; if the sun of that early career was eclipsed by the dark cloud that settled upon his latter end we can only regret the sad fact; peace to his memory; the fine service of Adolph M. Radin in his chosen field will be appropriately set forth during this session by one of our members; we remember, too, Joseph Herz, the kindly, genial rabbi of Columbus, Mississippi, who ministered to that community for many years and gained the love and esteem of all by his gentle service, and Louis Weiss, a member of our Conference from the beginning, who served in the cause in many communities giving his best wherever he was. *Alehem Hashalom!*

We have gathered, brethren, in this great Jewish center. Many of our members will have an opportunity of witnessing at first hand for the first time the remarkable efforts put forth by our noble minded and generous hearted co-religionists of America's metropolis towards the solution of problems as vexed and perplexing as any in the whole course of Judaism on this planet. Here all the currents of Jewish life and thought cross each other. Here the oldest and the newest elements of America's Jewish population meet. Here all sorts of Jewish *isms* are advocated.

The purpose of our coming here is to come into touch with all these varieties of Jewish experience, to gain renewed inspiration for our work in our home communities, to join hands with our brethren here in the metropolis and throughout the country in the arduous tasks which our common Jewish faith and inheritance impose upon us as a community, and to demonstrate by our deliberations and discussions that the religious element is fundamental in Jewish experience. The very happening that a large number of religious leaders are gathered to consider vital questions affecting modern Judaism emphasizes the fact so often overlooked by mistaken observers that Judaism's

purpose in the world is religious, and that the problems arising from the Jew's relations to his surroundings can be made to approach a satisfactory solution from the religious standpoint only.

Many and vexed points will come before us in the course of our deliberations. Trying situations may confront us. But, however trying, may the thought never be absent from us that the religious note which we are striking sounds forth peace. Whatever be the differences of view and outlook among us, and these differences are many and great, running the gamut from moderate reform to extreme radicalism, may these differences not culminate in discord, but through mutual consideration and yielding may the spirit of our religious brotherhood be constantly in evidence and to the fore. Then will this twentieth convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis aid in strengthening the religious life of American Jewry and contribute its quota towards the cumulative endeavor of Israel in the hastening of the day when the knowledge of God shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

And now in conclusion a personal word. By the wise provision of our constitution the incumbency of the holder of the presidential office in our organization is limited to two terms. This meeting marks, therefore, the close of my administration of the high trust with which you have honored me. I wish to express here and now my appreciation of the confidence you have reposed in me. I desire to thank my colleagues of the Executive Committee for their help and assistance in conducting the affairs of the Conference. May the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of God guide our deliberations during the week to come. May we find in our intercourse with one another refreshment of soul and inspiration for the tasks that lie before us. So may God will it!

B

DAVID EINHORN, THE UNCOMPROMISING CHAMPION
OF REFORM JUDAISM.

A BIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY BY DR. K. KOHLER.

Written for the One Hundredth Anniversary of his Birth.

Birthday anniversaries and centennials, such as our age of progress and of historical research loves to celebrate, are more than mere tributes of respect and gratitude to the men of the past. They serve as mile-posts on the road of human progress and as incentives to our own endeavors, while at the same time showing us from a wider perspective how far our lives and thoughts have been influenced by the great men we recognize as special agencies of divine Providence. For greatness is a relative quality. We are apt to call all the persons and things we admire great. Yet as we proceed, the greatness of yesterday often becomes the commonplace of today, and only few remain who will tomorrow tower above the rest. Only succeeding generations can judge whether the influence of a personality regarded as great will continue on the ascendancy so as to become permanent.

Among the galaxy of brilliant stars that shone on the Jewish firmament during the time of the Reform movement in Germany and America in the last century, David Einhorn will ever stand forth as a star of the first magnitude. Alongside of Abraham Geiger, the leader and pathfinder, and Samuel Holdheim, the bold and brilliant radical, Einhorn proved himself to be the clear-headed, uncompromising and unfaltering standard-bearer of Reform Judaism, who not merely gave positive and permanent shape to his principles, but embodied them in his life. He became their very incarnation. He fought for them and suffered for them as few did. His life is the best refutation of all the charges and aspersions hurled against Reform Judaism by

fanatics and cynics who know not what it means to undergo the bitterest persecution and martyrdom for the sake of a holy conviction. If any man in modern times realized to the full what the prophet Jeremiah says of himself: "The word of the Lord became in mine heart, as it were, a burning fire shut up in my bones, and though I weary myself in keeping it back, I can not"—that man was David Einhorn. He strove with God and with men and prevailed—a veritable Israel, blessed by his antagonists at the end. This renders the story of his life so interesting and so instructive.

EINHORN'S YOUTH.

David Einhorn was born in the little Bavarian village of Dispeck, in the vicinity of Fuerth, in the year 1809, on November 10th. His father died early, leaving the mother in comfortable circumstances; she, a woman of strong mentality, bent all her energies upon giving her children the best possible education, and succeeded in molding them into strong and independent characters. Young David in his earliest youth manifested an unusual eagerness and capacity for learning, and soon the village teacher's knowledge proved inadequate to the task of keeping pace with the rapid progress of his pupil. Before he had attained the tenth year of his age, the precocious youth was enrolled among the *Bahurim* (disciples) of the *Yeshibah* (Talmudic High School) of Fuerth under the leadership of Rabbi Wolf Hamburger. Though far younger than the rest of the pupils of the Preparatory, as later of the Main School of the Rabbinical Academy, he was not long in attracting the attention of his teachers and fellow-students by the keenness of his intellect and by his versatility in the discussion which plays so important a role in the pilpulistic method of Talmudic studies. He was soon known as one of the foremost disciples of R. Wolf Hamburger, and when only seventeen years of age, received his Rabbinical diploma, the Faculty of the *Yeshibah*, the *Beth Din* (Court of Justice), dwelling in terms of highest praise and admiration upon the great erudition acquired in so brief a time and in so

thorough a manner by the youthful disciple. In the opinion of these authorities at Fuerth, who provided a large portion of German Jewry with rabbis, competency in Talmud lore constituted the entire equipment required for the Rabbinical career. The great philosophical and scientific problems of religion did not concern them, and were, in fact, beyond their mental horizon. Had young Einhorn followed their advice and remained on the beaten path, he might have become as sagacious a pilpulist as Hirsch Yanov, or a renowned casuist like Samuel Kaydanower, the author of *Beth Shemuel*, the beau-ideal of the Yeshibah. But, like so many of his fellow-students, he had stealthily tasted of the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge by taking private lessons in the classics and mathematics, and, while craving for the larger truth, he would not rest satisfied until he had quenched his thirst at the fountains of modern culture within his reach. the Bavarian Universities of Erlangen, Wuerzburg and Munich. Here began the great conflict, within and without, between the old and the new, which makes the life of every honest truth-seeker so bitter a struggle. The very intention of entering a University was, as I can testify from my own experience thirty-five years later, regarded in the circles of orthodoxy in Fuerth as the first step towards apostasy. What the Proverbs say of the evil woman: "None that go unto her return again" and "Numerous are those slain by her" was, in all seriousness, applied to university education.

The Jewish community of Fuerth, built up in the sixteenth century chiefly by the refugees of Nuernberg, of Prague and Vienna, had become famous for its Talmudic school and its Jewish printing press; but its rabbis, mostly imported from Poland, introduced there a most unscientific and unwholesome method of Talmud study and adhered tenaciously to every superstitious practice, approving of the very abuses of Synagogue custom as "inherited law." Nowhere throughout Germany, accordingly, was the opposition to modern ideas so strong as in these circles. When the Jews of Northern Germany were all astir at the heralding of a new era by Moses Mendelssohn, the

head of the Yeshibah of Fuerth was the first of whom Mendelssohn learned that his Pentateuch translation was to come under the ban. Every innovation was denounced as treason to Judaism. Woe to the student discovered with a German or Latin book (*Terefah Posul*). A characteristic tale is told of one of the learned Talmudists of Fuerth: Summoned before the magistrate to give a written deposition, he sent his wife as a substitute. When questioned as to why her husband did not appear, she naively replied: "My husband is a Hebrew scholar; he can not write German." No wonder, then, that both the Bavarian government and the enlightened portion of the Jewish community were determined to make an end to such a system of obscurantism and ignorance. In the year 1826, the very same year that Einhorn had completed his Rabbinical studies, the Talmud school of Fuerth by special legislation was ordered to include modern branches of study, such as philosophy, literature, history and natural science in its curriculum, in order to enable the future rabbis and teachers emanating therefrom to exert an elevating influence upon the Jewish communities of the land. The order was never carried out. R. Wolf Hamburger, a descendant of Gabriel Baerman, the founder of the school, was too narrow-minded to make any concessions to the just demands of the age, and in his works has only words of bitter complaint regarding the hostilities he encountered, which ended in the dispersion and expulsion of his pupils and the closing of the school. The good, pious man, in common with his colleagues, R. Mendel Kargau, Jehuda Loeb Halberstadt and others, failed to see that a new generation had arisen that would no longer be fed solely upon the dry husks of the Talmud, as were Seligman Baer Bamberger, afterward Rabbi in Wuerzburg, and Abraham Wechsler, Rabbi in Schwabach, and their like, but craved for wholesome and fresh food for mind and soul, such as only modern culture—not to speak of the forbidden philosophy of Maimonides—could offer. They saw in the University-trained rabbis who attempted to cleanse Jewish life of its abuses only traitors and apostates, and their fanaticism and intolerance

only tended to widen the gulf between them and the Reformers, or "Neologues," as they were then called. No doubt in many a young Rabbi manhood and independence was crushed by the fanaticism and intolerance of orthodoxy, especially when the Bavarian Government changed its tactics and declared itself opposed to the "neologues." Not so with Einhorn. His courage and zeal in the cause of truth and honesty was only roused to greater determination by the denunciations and enmities, open or covert, he had to encounter.

UNIVERSITY TRAINING.

Now, as we follow Einhorn to the Bavarian Universities of Erlangen, Wuerzburg and Munich, we find no such pitfalls to the faith placed in his path as were imagined by the rabbis of Fuerth. The spirit fostered there, and particularly under the influence of the romantic King Ludwig I, was thoroughly conservative. The chilling blasts of historical criticism which obtained dominion elsewhere in Germany through the Hegelian school, were not allowed to affect the philosophical or theological studies in Bavaria. Schelling was the leader and the idol of the schools, and he stopped neither at Kant's criticism nor at Fichte's subjectivism, but entwined philosophy and religion, unifying the ideal and the real, so as to make seer and sage, seeker after the One God. To him all heathen mythologies were but refractions of an original revelation; and the startling discoveries and decipherments of the time which brought buried civilizations of a hoary antiquity with their modes of worship and of thought to the light of day, seemed to confirm this view. Here seemed to be offered the key wherewith to unlock the mysteries of old India and Egypt. The symbolism of Kreuzer and the mysticism of Goerres, both admired for their comprehensive grasp of the religions of the East and their mysteries, were taken as corroborative proofs of Schelling's system. Nature and the human soul were studied from this new point of view,

and the Mosaic cult, too, appeared in a new light because of the symbolic meaning lent thereto.

For the Talmud student whose mental horizon had all along been circumscribed by the four ells of the Halakah, this wide grasp of the world's thought and purpose must needs have had keen fascination. It certainly captivated Isaac Bernays when he wrote the "Bibelsche Orient," afterwards disowned by him. David Einhorn was too clear-headed and resourceful to simply adopt these ideas without testing and modifying them. The fundamental ideas, however, of an original monotheism and of the symbolic nature of the ancient forms of worship appealed to him as being in accord with the spirit of Mosaism. He discarded the mystic, the pagan and Christian elements of Schelling's philosophy and accentuated all the more the intellectual and ethical superiority of Mosaism, which to him was not a system of laws fixed for all time, but a system of doctrines in accord with the progress of the ages.

When he returned from Munich, Einhorn was no longer an adherent of Rabbinic orthodoxy, but an all the more ardent and intense believer in Judaism, or, as he then termed it, Mosaism, burning with the desire to make his rich and fertile powers of mind and heart, of pen and tongue, felt in Jewry. But he soon found himself proscribed as an *Apicoros* (Unbeliever) and a *Poshea Yisrael* (Transgressor) without having given the slightest cause for offence by his religious practice. His teachers instinctively dreaded the man they formerly admired for his vigorous intellect. Only R. Joshua Moses Falkenau, a profound thinker, who often regretted his lack of modern training, welcomed back his favorite pupil as the man of the future.

FIRST POSITION.

There were rabbinical positions open for the young candidate, but intrigues and denunciations of the meanest and most malicious character were resorted to by Hamburger and his associates to prevent his election by the congregation or his confirmation as Rabbi by the Bavarian Government. He had to spend

ten years in bitter disappointment and anguish, until at last, in 1842, he received a call from the Jewish community of Hoppstaedten and vicinity as Chief Rabbi (Landesrabbiner) of Birkenfeld in the Grand-Duchy of Oldenburg. There he found a congenial though rather small field for his labors in the cause of Reform Judaism. Both Dr. Gruenebaum and Bernhard Wechsler, his scholarly predecessors, had prepared the soil for the seeds of truth which, under Einhorn's powerful and efficient leadership, sprouted forth in Synagogue and school into a blessed fruitage, the memory of which abode there long after he had left for other lands and clime.

He enjoyed the warm support of the liberal-minded government in his efforts at obtaining the full social and political emancipation of the Jews, and particularly in stamping out deep-rooted abuses in the Synagogue (See *Israelit XIX Jahrht* 1847, 335-44), above all the horrible practice of early burials, against which he kept up an incessant warfare in this country also, and in opposition to which Moses Mendelssohn already had raised his voice.

The year 1844 brought him also the long-sought-for peace and comfort of home-life by his marriage to Julie Henrietta Ochs, of a prominent family in Kreuznach, the esteemed woman whose unique devotion and self-sacrificing love, coupled with rare practical wisdom, became a tower of strength and an unfailing source of inspiration to him on his changeful and thorny path, and who survived him by well nigh thirty years.

EINHORN'S PART IN THE GREAT ISSUES OF THE DAY.

But the calm and peaceful life he enjoyed in Hoppstaedten was only preparatory to the years of strife and tumult that awaited him in the larger arena of the world. Great issues set the Jewish world astir, and the faithful shepherd David would not remain hidden among his flock. Three controversies arose during the years 1842-1844 which, by the importance of the principles involved and by the passion they aroused among

the combatants, turned German Jewry into hostile camps in which both theologians and laymen had to take sides. These were the Hamburg Prayerbook Controversy, the Geiger-Tiktin Controversy at Breslau and the one concerning the Frankfurt Reform Verein. In the first of these Einhorn could not participate, as he was just entering upon his new sphere of activity at Hoppstaedten when Isaac Bernays put his interdict upon the Reform Prayerbook of the Temple in Hamburg. Yet no sooner was Einhorn settled in his new position than we see him step into the fray full-armed with all the characteristic force of a penetrating intellect and of undaunted courage in response to the questions asked by the Breslau officials as to the compatibility of free research with the exercise of the Rabbinical functions. Among the learned and weighty opinions of sixteen theologians of recognized authority, among whom were the aged Friedlander of Brilon, Westphalia, and Aaron Chorin of Arad, Moravia, Kirchenrath Meyer of Stuttgart, Holdheim of Schwerin and others, Einhorn's voice sounds like the roaring of a young lion reverberating through the forest. He does not argue with the head merely, like many others; he writes with his heart's blood. Geiger's experience had, on a smaller scale, been his own. He, too, had been and still was persecuted, proscribed and outlawed as an "Apicoros," as a transgressor and denier of the Torah. Shall the old Deuteronomic law, relentlessly consigning to death idolaters and seducers to idolatry, as well as rebellious defyers of the judicial authorities of the land, be still applied in theory, if not in practice, to such men as do not accept the Rabbinical interpretation of the Law as divine revelation and have by conscientious investigation arrived at different views of the origin and character of the Talmudical and Biblical laws? Shall honest, truth-seeking Jews of the stamp of Geiger, who place their whole life in the service of Judaism, devoting all their energies to its elucidation and spiritualization in order to save it from stagnation and decay, be classed¹ among thieves and murderers, because a petrified statute of the Talmud which

had its origin in times of peril is in all its unmitigated severity codified by Maimonides and Joseph Caro? (See *Abodah Zarah* 26b; *Maimoni H. Rotzeah* iv, 10; *H. Ab Zarah* x, 1; *Yoreh Deah* 158, 2.) Einhorn challenges the fanatics, foremost among them Solomon Eiger of Posen, to carry out to the letter the law of the Codes. "The time when people feared your anathemas is past. We need such men as Geiger, who in honest and earnest search after truth strive to separate the kernel from the shell, the pure gold of the law from the dross and the worthless accretion. The Talmud can not claim infallibility; it is at best a vessel of divine truth, but not itself divine. It contains widely divergent opinions. It never had a binding character for all Jewry. On the contrary, blind belief in all its utterances, even in the field of the Halakah, may lead to horrible mischief and abuse. Nor, indeed, did medieval authorities hesitate to change the Talmudical law by reform measures necessitated by the time."

The charge of being a Karaite brought against Geiger, Einhorn refutes by saying that as long as the investigation of the Talmudic sources does not assail the principle of tradition upon which Rabbinical Judaism rests, the charge is unfounded. "Neither can he be deprived of his title as Rabbi and the right to exercise the rabbinical functions who does not allow his scientific investigations to affect his practice, and Geiger's solemn declaration to that effect is as trustworthy as was that of the high priest at the time when the suspicion of Sadduceeism rested upon the sacred office. Nor does the departure from ceremonial laws unfit a man from holding the rabbinical office, if it is the outcome of the honest conviction that the same is in keeping with the spirit of Judaism and the product of deep, honest and unprejudiced inquiry into the sacred sources, coupled with pious earnestness and glowing enthusiasm. It is, of course, necessary that other competent men imbued with zeal for God and religion arrive at the same conclusion. Such a departure deserves commendation rather than condemnation, as the Rabbis at all times abrogated and changed

Biblical laws when altered conditions demanded it. Geiger, far from being unworthy of his rabbinical charge, deserves the highest credit for his endeavors to regenerate Judaism."

With the same firmness and decision, however, that Einhorn fought for the principle of progress, of free research and reform in this, his first public utterance, he opposed the reckless, schismatic attempts of the Frankfurt Reform Verein. To a Christian friend who was favorably impressed by the program of the Frankfurt Radicals which, in three paragraphs, aimed to have the Mosaic law, the Talmudic system and the expectation of a Messiah abrogated and have an undefined and unrestricted development of Mosaism put in the place of historical Judaism, Einhorn wrote a letter which was published in the "*Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*," 1844, p. 87f. Therein he dwells chiefly upon the first paragraph of the Frankfurt platform, which declares Mosaism to be capable of an unlimited development, and says: "The entire history of Judaism, yea, the Talmud itself, gives evidence of Judaism's capability of development. But such a development could and can only take place upon the immovable foundations of Mosaism—which are monotheism and belief in divine revelation. In this sense have all modern Jewish theologians set to themselves the task of bringing about a reform of Judaism in a twofold way: by resuscitating the dormant spirit which created the now petrified and soulless forms, and by scrutinizing and reducing the number of forms which threaten to crush the life of Judaism. In order to be able to attain this, the spirit, the idea underlying the law, must, in accordance with the teaching of the prophets, be placed in the foreground and the essentials separated from the temporary forms.

"But while this is done in principle by the reform theologians, the practical regeneration of Judaism is, owing to the great obstacles it has to encounter, only a matter of slow and gradual progress. Yet this very work of regeneration is wantonly interfered with by this so-called Reform Society which, at a time when a consolidation of all our forces is greatly needed

in view of the many disintegrating and hostile powers that we have to encounter, under the mask of reform aims at a schismatic disruption, nay, at the uprooting and the overthrow of Judaism. It wants to put anarchy in the place of law. Instead of pointing out what is mutable and transitory and what is immutable and permanent, either in the doctrine or the law of Mosaism, it declares the same to be in a process of perpetual and unlimited motion, which is tantamount to saying that it has no divine character at all, that it is human in origin and may culminate in Spinozism. The apostles of a new religion built on mere negation have renounced not merely the externals, but the kernel, the doctrines of Mosaism: they avowedly reduce the divine wisdom which all the generations of the past have drawn from the teachings of the Law, to the level of the treasures of wisdom attained by the great intellects of all nations. The two latter paragraphs, which are only crude reiterations of views expressed by others, are thrown out as a bait for the would-be enlightened, who only long for emancipation from the old and the obsolete."

"In all its stages," Einhorn states in a sentence which contains in a nutshell the whole theological system of the great Reformer, "Judaism shows its capacity for continuous development both as to its form and its spirit, insofar as the latter became ever clearer and purer in the human consciousness; and no Israelite who knows his religion will deny it the power of perfectibility. Its essence, which is truth uniting all men, was from the beginning intended to overcome the exclusiveness attached to the form, which is national; but insofar as the latter served as an armor of protection and as the priestly garb of Israel among the nations, it can not with impunity be cast off until the former in its entire inner force and its all-encompassing extent will have penetrated the whole human family, and Israel (Mosaism) have fulfilled its priestly mission at the arrival of the Messianic era."

EINHORN AT THE RABBINICAL CONFERENCES.

The Reform Verein, started by cultured, or rather hypercultured, laymen of a decided anti-theological bias, died shortly after its birth; its own fathers disowned it. But the agitation in favor of the abolition of circumcision and of the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday, which had called it forth, continued and finally led to the creation of the Reform Congregation at Berlin, which under Holdheim sanctioned intermarriage, besides the two radical reform measures above mentioned. To calm the general unrest by deliberations on the principles, modes and measures of Reform, and to give plan and unity to the movement, the German Rabbinical Conferences were called together by Dr. Ludwig Philippson. On the whole, they did not accomplish much, owing to the political conditions which interfered. They created new issues and divisions, and gave rise to Frankel's historical school of Moderate Reform on the one hand, and Holdheim's Radical Reform on the other, but they furnished abundant material of permanent value for systematic Reform.

It is highly interesting to note the stand taken by Dr. Einhorn at these Conferences. In the first one held at Brunswick in 1844, for some reason or other he, like so many other noted Reform Rabbis, did not take part. In fact, it was poorly attended and badly managed. A spirit of radicalism prevailed, probably due to a certain unpreparedness. All the better attended, and we may add prepared, was the second Conference, held in Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1845, and here Einhorn at once became conspicuous by his pointed, lucid and pronounced utterances. Against Frankel's insistence upon the maintenance of the Hebrew language in the Synagogue liturgy, he remarked that "while the Talmud leaves no doubt as to the permissibility of the vernacular in the liturgy, he would urge its use in the divine service as a necessity today. Hebrew is the language of the study of the Law. As long as prayer was mainly the cry of the oppressed Jew, the scarcely intelligible Hebrew suf-

ficed. Now people need prayer as the simple expression of their innermost thoughts, convictions and sentiments. This can only be attained through the mother-tongue." For this reason he unequivocally opposed the committee's distinction between a subjective and an objective necessity of using the vernacular in the service. "Sentiment is praiseworthy," he said, "but not that morbid sentimentalism which paralyzes, nay, kills all spiritual life. By striking the rock of a dead language we can not bring forth living waters to quench the thirst of the people" (*Proceedings*, p. 27; 49).

As the first speaker on the Committee's report, which proposed the mention of the Messianic idea in the liturgy to the exclusion of all political aspirations, Einhorn at once points to the underlying principle. "For the Talmudic Jew," he says, "the Messianic hope is inseparable from the whole ceremonial law, on the full observance of which his salvation depends. Only the sacrificial cult in a restored Temple and State would work atonement for him; hence his wonderful abiding hope in the restitution of its former glory. Our views have entirely changed. We no longer believe in the atoning power of sacrifice and priesthood connected with the holy land. We stand upon the ground of prophetic Judaism which aims at a universal worship of God by righteousness. Israel's political overthrow, formerly bewailed as a misfortune, in reality is its forward move toward its larger destiny. Prayer took the place of sacrifice. From Israel's midst the word of God was to be carried to all parts of the earth, and new religious systems were to aid in this great work. The Talmud moves in a circle, whereas we today believe in progress." "The Messianic idea (which I formerly took to be a substitute for the immortality idea) expresses, in my opinion, the hope of both earthly and heavenly salvation. There is nothing objectionable therein. The belief in Israel's election also contains nothing that is repugnant. On the contrary, it should be retained in the service as expressing the claim of an undeniable privilege, as it engenders in the Jew a feeling of reassuring self-consciousness over against

the ruling church." Accordingly, Einhorn wanted all the petitions for the restoration of bloody sacrifices and of political independence eliminated, and have put in their stead the Messianic prayers so framed as to express the hope for a spiritual rebirth and the uniting of all men in faith and in love by the agencies of Israel." (*Proceedings*, p. 74f.) Thus we see here all the points accentuated that formed the basis of Einhorn's theological system, and especially of his Prayerbook.

Of course, he voted for the reading of the Haftarah lesson in the vernacular, expressing regret that the reading of the Torah lesson in the vernacular could not at once also be voted for (*p.* 134). The book of Esther, only, did he want read in Hebrew alone (*p.* 137); the reason, though not stated, is obvious. Quite characteristic is the reason given for the then discussed abolition of the custom of calling up seven men for the reading from the Torah: "It should not appear as if woman was excluded from the benefits of the Torah" (*p.* 144). In regard to the playing of the organ on Sabbath, while agreeing with the arguments offered by others, that the same law that abrogated the prohibition of certain work in the Temple of old holds good also in our Synagogue, he adds the elucidating remark that "the distinction between the ancient Temple and the Synagogue made by the Talmudists is due to their adherence to the belief in the sacrificial cult which we no longer share. Hence, our Synagogue takes the place of the ancient Temple" (*p.* 147).

In the discussion on the Sabbath question, which formed the central feature of the Third Conference held at Breslau in 1846, Einhorn took the stand, adhered to by Holdheim and opposed by Geiger, that the Biblical Sabbath, for which cessation from labor is the chief command, bears the character of a symbol (*Oth*). It is to remind Israel of God, the Creator and the Deliverer from bondage. The idea of the universal Sabbath of the Decalogue Einhorn, obviously, had then not yet arrived at. With regard to the Second Holy Day, he points out (*Proc. III*, 87) that, in the opinion of the Rabbis, the

whole Jewish calendar derived its sanction from a fictitious authorization by the defunct Synhedrion at Jerusalem. We no longer consider Jerusalem as the center of Judaism. By the abolition of the Second Holiday, which in the Talmud also is in many ways regarded as inferior to the first day, we declare our religious independence of Palestine.

Two reports, one written for the Conference as Referee of the Committee on the Position of Woman, and another as Chairman of the Committee on the Dietary Laws, are masterpieces of Talmudic scholarship and historical research, full of valuable material for theoretical and practical reform to this very day. In the one he shows, in addition to the paper read by Samuel Adler on the subject, how the social, legal and religious inferiority assigned to woman in the Mosaic Law was aggravated and rendered even more humiliating in the Talmudic Law for reasons which find their explanation in the Rabbinical system. Referring to Geiger's epoch-making article in his *Theologische Zeitschrift* of 1837, Einhorn undertakes to show that "the inequality of woman in the Mosaic Law forms part of the ancient priestly system of castes, which need not and should not be kept up in a higher state of religious education, whereas Rabbinism beholds in woman an inferior creature altogether, excluding her from the greatest privileges of religion in the Synagogue and public life and lowering her to such an extent as to institute a special benediction for man, thanking God that he was not made a woman. We have long outlived the notion of natural inequality of men in regard to holiness. The distinctions made by Holy Writ have, for us, only relative and temporary value. It is, therefore, our sacred duty to declare, with all emphasis, woman's perfect religious equality with man. It is true, life, which is stronger than all theory, has already accomplished much in this respect, but much is still wanting, and even the little that has been accomplished still lacks legal sanction. It therefore behooves us, as far as it is possible, to declare the religious equality of woman, both as to her duties and her rights and privileges, to be in accord with

the Jewish law. We have the same right to do so as had the Synod of Rabbenu Gershom eight hundred years ago when passing new religious decrees in favor of the female sex. The Talmud, with reference to the Mezuzzah, says: 'Should the men only have the promise of the lengthening of their days and not also the women?' So say we in regard to woman's religious life. Let us reclaim her spiritual powers for the religious community; they have been kept back only too long" (III, 253-265). Here we have a forecast of the leading ideas for a reform of the Jewish Marriage and Divorce laws, such as was proposed by Einhorn at the Philadelphia Conference in 1869 and endorsed by Samuel Adler, his fellow member on the Committee on the Position of Woman and author of a more conservative Hebrew paper on the subject for the Frankfurt Conference.

In the other Report on the Dietary Laws, published in the *Israelit des XIX. Jahrh.* of 1847, and republished with a few additions in the *Sinai* of 1859 and 1860, Einhorn endeavors to establish a working theory for the reform made necessary by the universal disregard of both the Biblical and the Rabbinical laws on diet; for, he says, the mere indulgence of the indifferent masses in the cravings of the stomach can not justify our reform, which must be based upon a deep religious conviction. Still, nowhere does there exist such a wide chasm between the life of the people and the law as here, and it is ever more widened by the belief that in disobeying the law they cease to be Jews. Going back to first principles, he finds that the law forbidding the eating of unclean meat, which declares both him who eats and him who touches it to be unclean, forms part of the system of priestly purity and impurity which could only be carried out in connection with the priestly cult of sacrifices and purifications, but not at a time and in lands where such cult no longer exists. Now, while the Talmud lends to the dietary laws an independent and altogether new character, declaring them to be divine statutes defying all reasoning and adding innumerable new prohibitions to the Biblical ones,

we declare them, in common with all Levitical laws on purity, to have no longer any binding character for us, as we no longer live in a theocratic Jewish state. All the more should they be abrogated, interfering as they do with our high mission as a priest-people to bring our sacred truth home to the people surrounding us. Not because all ceremonial laws should be abolished in the Messianic era, as was Holdheim's main argument, nor because as symbolic laws the dietary prohibitions have lost their significance and potency, as Samuel Hirsch and other members of the same Committee argued, but because the Law itself was not intended for our age. This is the position taken by Einhorn, by which, he says, we are enabled to establish a great reform without making war against the divine will as expressed in the Law, and without undermining the authority of the Bible and the foundation of its moral essence.

EINHORN'S RELATIONS TO HOLDHEIM.

As pronounced, however, as Einhorn was in his opposition to the principles of Talmudic legalism, so firm was he in refuting any unjust attack upon the Rabbinical sources and views. This he showed in a controversy with Holdheim, which forms one of the most interesting dramatic incidents in the life of the two reformers. In reference to the Kol Nidre formula, the elimination of which from the Atonement Eve Service had been voted for unanimously by the Conference at Frankfurt, Holdheim had published an article in the *Israelit des XIX. Jahrh.* of 1844, in which he stated that, according to the Talmudic Halakah, all kinds of oaths, including those made in relation to other persons, could be annulled either beforehand or after they had been made, and that, therefore, not only the Kol Nidre formula, but the entire Talmudic law ought to be disavowed by the Reform Rabbis. Einhorn replied, calmly, yet sternly, warning his colleague against such a harmful misrepresentation of the Talmud. Holdheim, however, persisted in his charge, alleging new Talmudic passages in support of

his statement; whereupon Einhorn, in the "*Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*" of 1845, launched forth in the most scathing terms an attack on his colleague, denouncing his entire argument as a fabric of falsehood and slander while defending the Talmud on every point with a zeal hardly to be surpassed by the most conservative Rabbi. His concluding words were: "My eyes are now opened as to Holdheim's method of procedure. I and all those who stand for the Truth and the honor of the Jew desire to see traditional Judaism transformed into a progressive faith and purified from its obnoxious and worthless elements, but not slandered and stabbed as by an assassin's hand." Einhorn's rejoinder, betraying by its very vehemence the loyalty of the Jew to his sacred heritage, had a wondrous effect on his antagonist. They clasped hands as friends when soon afterwards they met at Frankfurt and remained close friends for life. Einhorn became Holdheim's successor as Chief-Rabbi of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, in 1847, when the latter left for Berlin to take charge of the Reform Congregation there, and the first volume of sermons published by Holdheim, as Radical Reformer, in 1852, was dedicated to "David Einhorn, his Friend and Co-Worker (*Gesinnungsgenosse*), Rabbi of Pesth." This was as Einhorn was on his way to take charge of the Reform Congregation of Pesth in Hungary.

While differing in temperament and in their points of view, they were drawn together by their love of truth and of inner freedom, and their mutual esteem grew in the same measure as they frankly and publicly criticised and discussed each other's views.

One essential point of difference must be mentioned here, as it concerns the basic idea of their theological differences. Holdheim, in his important work, "*Das Ceremonialgesetz im Messiasreich*," takes the position that, inasmuch as the ceremonial laws were intended, in the Mosaic theocracy, to separate Israel as a holy nation from the rest of mankind, they can have no validity in the Messianic era of universalism which is approaching. Furthermore, he holds that the character of per-

petuity assigned by the Rabbis to the ceremonial laws and particularly the sacrificial cult, which together with other theocratic laws they declare to have been suspended but not abolished, also involves the perpetual separation of Israel as a holy nation and of Palestine as a holy land. It was inconsistent in the Rabbis, however, to declare on the one hand that since the destruction of the Temple, prayer or the reading of the chapters on the Sacrifices or the fast on Yom Kippur takes the place of the atoning sacrificial cult, and, on the other hand, to say that the converted heathen will have a place in the Messianic kingdom. Against this Einhorn in a critique replete with evidences of amazing scholarship, points out that the only substitute for the atoning sacrifice during Israel's banishment from the Holy Land was, in the opinion of the Rabbis, the suffering and affliction of the Exile, wherefore the Orthodox Jew is consistent when he opposes Jewish emancipation, finding full salvation only in the restoration of the sacrificial cult in the Holy Land. The Rabbis are, therefore, perfectly consistent in believing in the immutability of the theocratic laws of Moses, because for them the Jewish people are by their very nature superior in holiness to the rest of the nations and the converted heathen can never claim the same degree of holiness as the Jew. For us today the holiness of the Jewish people as well as the binding character of the ceremonial laws has only a relative or educational character, as the Messianic era signifies for us the restitution of the whole human family into covenant-ship with God. (See *Israelit. des XIX. Jahrh.*, 1846, *Literaturblatt*, Sept., Oct.). We shall see later on that the idea of Israel's holiness as priest among the nations plays quite an important role in Einhorn's Reform theology, especially in regard to intermarriage. As to the ceremonial laws, he clearly distinguishes between such as have still the power of expressing vital truths or of protecting them and their bearer against vitiating influences and those void of the power. "Altogether," he says, "we have passed the stage of negation; we are positive and constructive, not destroyers, as we are called by the

romanticists who wail over the dead past but lack faith in the future, having no religious convictions of their own."

EINHORN'S ELECTION AS CHIEF-RABBI OF MECKLENBURG-SCHWERIN.

All these discussions and deliberations of the Reform Rabbis, and in particular the Conferences, called forth the protests and anathemas of the leaders of orthodoxy, and Einhorn was again made the target of a fanatical onslaught by Rabbi Wolf Hamburger of Fuerth. No sooner did the latter learn that the position of Chief-Rabbi of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, vacated by Holdheim, was to be filled by his former pupil than he wrote a denunciatory letter to some private individual there, assailing not only his religious, but also his moral character in the most abusive terms, as if he, "the insolent and wicked infidel," as he called him, had obtained his rabbinical diploma by deceit and hypocrisy. Of course, Einhorn was not the man to bear such effrontery in meekness; he exposed the plot and the plotter unsparingly before he entered upon his new field of activity. He at once realized that here he had a far more arduous task before him than heretofore, as there were numerous communities under his rabbinate containing strong elements of opposition to the principles of Reform. He foresaw enmity and strife on the part of the Orthodox. All the more striking is the clarion note of firmness and of hopeful optimism which permeates his powerful inaugural address delivered on September 4, 1847, the first in the collection of Einhorn's sermons edited by me in 1880. He finds a drop of bitter wormwood in his cup of joy in seeing a portion of his flock unwilling to follow his guidance and come to a mutual understanding with him, yet he trusts in God and His holy truth, to teach which is his high calling. The task of the religious teacher in modern Israel is to him to liberate the spirit, the vital kernel of Judaism from its incrustation, and to consign that which is dead, though sorrowingly, as we do the dear departed, to the grave, in order

that healthy and vigorous religious life may sprout forth, where now there is but mould and decay. The Jew in Synagogue and school-house, in his industrial and social pursuits, must be made to feel that his religion does not want to separate him from the world to which he is to bring his light of a pure faith in God and man, nor to nourish the hope of a return to a long-abandoned home—which was indeed a great source of comfort for the persecuted Jew—but to strengthen the bonds of brotherhood between man and man, and interlink all as children of our Heavenly Father. We commit treason against our sacred mission if we do not do all within our power to wipe out the last traces of our alienism in the land whose blessings of culture we enjoy. Nor should the Reformer rush along with passionate vehemence, disregarding the inner and outward conditions of the community and the ripeness of its members. The leader must act with discretion. The lamps of the Menorah cast their light forward upon the Holy place, but within the Holy of Holies there was no light; for God's majesty is the embodiment of light, says the Midrash. For him who has penetrated the innermost sanctuary of Judaism, ceremonies may be superfluous. So will all symbolic forms be at the time of the universal knowledge of God, to which we look forward. But as yet we have not arrived at so ideal an age. While doing away, then, with all soulless ceremonies, which are hindrances rather than helps to the true religious life, the Reform leader must guard against injuring and thwarting Judaism's healthy progress by divesting it of all ceremonies, even such as still have religious vitality, and positive value. At the same time he must have the courage to battle for the principle of truth and against all that, which, according to his view, is the very reverse of religious truth in the liturgy. Like Elijah, he must take a decisive stand, and say to the people: "How long halt ye between two opinions; if the Lord be God, follow Him; if Baal, then follow him." Einhorn at once made a deep impression upon his hearers, as a man of independence and originality of mind and of a deep religious conviction.

THE CIRCUMCISION CONTROVERSY.

Sooner than expected came the opportunity to show his mettle. A liberal Jew of the town of Tetrow in Mecklenburg refused to have his son circumcised, declaring that he would bring him up as a loyal Jew none the less; and, accordingly, wanted him enrolled in the list of Jewish children and, in accordance with the Synagogue regulation of the land, solemnly named at the divine service. The Jewish officials hesitated to comply with this request, whereupon the religious teacher there asked the Jewish Directorate (Oberrath) of Schwerin, of which Einhorn was the head, for a decision. The reply, given by him two months after his installation, was to the effect that the admission of the child into the Jewish fold, according to Talmudic law, is not conditioned upon the act of circumcision, as the child of Jewish parents, respectively of a Jewish mother, is a Jew in every respect, as is expressly declared in a note added by the Rabbinical authorities of Fuerth to Behr's Catechism of 1826, p. 57. It furthermore states that a Jew, even though he transgress the laws, be they of a ceremonial or purely religious character, nevertheless remains a Jew. Nay, though he become an idolater, an apostate, a Christian convert, or an atheist, he can not cut himself loose from the bond which entwines all the members of the Jewish community together, from their first breath of life to the very last. The intentional omission of the circumcision rite is by no means considered by the Rabbis as tantamount to a disavowal of the Jewish faith, as is public violation of the Sabbath, but is expressly declared to be regarded as any other transgression (Yoreh Deah II:7). Yet even the public violator of the Sabbath can not be deprived of his rights and titles as Jew, whether in marriage or in burial, or even in participation in the divine service as one of the ten persons required for Minyan. Still less can he be expelled from the religious community of Israel who omits the performance of the Abrahamitic rite because of a religious conviction which leads him to assume that the law has no longer a binding character upon the Jew

in his present stage of religious development. Particularly is this the case if it is emphatically declared, as is done here, that he desires to be a Jew and also to raise his child as a Jew. The naming of the child in question, therefore, is to take place as usual in accordance with the Synagogue regulations. The decision closes with the following significant sentence: "May God bless the child and crown him with the virtues befitting an Israelite of a circumcised heart; may all those troubled and dismayed by events that seem to imperil our divine religion, the covenant concluded by God with Israel and with humanity and sealed by the precious blood of our forefathers, be reassured by the thought that, that which is divine is by its very nature indestructible. Judaism rests upon the immovable pillars of justice, truth and peace, pillars which are not shaken, though the earth wax old like a garment and the heavens vanish like smoke."

This decision, while perfectly correct from the point of view of Talmudic law, created a great stir in all Jewish circles and met with protests from many sides, as it seemed to encourage the anti-circumcision movement of Frankfurt, Hamburg and Berlin. But the sensation was increased by an article written by Prof. Franz Delitzsch, the well known Lutheran theologian and chief worker for the conversion of the Jews, then at the University of Rostock. Therein every statement of the decision was contradicted and reference was made to the Biblical penalty of *Kareth* (Extermination) for the omission of the circumcision rite. "Disobedience of a law due to a denial of the divine character of the same," says Delitzsch, "is actually a denial of the divine revelation, which places the person in question outside of the Jewish fold. In former times the Sanhedrin saw to it that the child was circumcised, in case the father omitted to do so. Instead of convincing the father in this case of his obligation to have the rite performed, the Israelitisch Directorate of Mecklenburg encouraged him in his persistence to disobey the law by arguments which a large portion of the Jewish community will reject as flimsy and base-

less." The article closes with this characteristic statement: "The path of emancipation from the Old Testament law and its penalty is far remote from the unjustified self-emancipation which places something between Judaism and Christianity, which is neither shell *with* the kernel nor kernel *without* the shell." Einhorn's reply was unsparing in pointing out Delitzsch's total ignorance of the Talmudic law of which he posed as the defender. He set forth the proof from the Talmud that the conviction that certain Biblical laws have only a temporary character, and are therefore subject to abrogation, is not considered a disavowal of the divine origin of the Bible. "Rabbinical Judaism represents a stage of progress in advance of the letter of the Old Testament, and the abrogation of the entire Ceremonial law is predicted in the Talmud for the Messianic time. Uncircumcised Israelites, both from the Biblical and the Rabbinical point of view, were regarded as full Israelites. Professor Delitzsch aims by his insistence on circumcision to force the Jew to knock at the door of the Christian Church for emancipation from the yoke of the Law. Even the conservative Jew will know what to think of such a guide to salvation." In a counter-reply Delitzsch brought forth new and more forcible arguments drawn from the Talmud and the Codes which he now took up for study, but they were all met by the fire of Einhorn's weapons, all but one. This was the Talmudic passage quoted by Delitzsch and codified by Maimonides and Joseph Karo, which holds that anyone denying the divine character of a single letter of the Torah is a heretic and deserving of death, and consequently unworthy to officiate as Jew in Jewish rites. Of course, this stronghold of orthodoxy will endure until it has become its tomb. The Talmudic principle, adduced by Einhorn, that no matter whatever sin or treason a Jew may commit, he remains a Jew nevertheless, is scarcely applicable here; but having once placed himself upon the Talmudic standpoint, he could not directly consign this and similar utterances, as he did elsewhere, to the tomb of oblivion, as survivals of an age when the horrors of idolatry

could only be exterminated by fire and sword. Instead of this he boldly declares at the close of his last reply, that the Jew is Jew by birth and remains a Jew even when an apostate, and that "he who holds any of the Mosaic ceremonial laws to be no longer binding because he is convinced that God no longer speaks through them, but at the same time clings with every fibre of his heart to the eternal truths and the purely religious laws of Judaism, is not only not an apostate but must be regarded as a diligent promoter of the Messianic kingdom" (*Sinai* 1857-1858). The decision that a child born of a Jewish mother is in every respect to be regarded as a Jew was, upon the motion of Dr. Einhorn, unanimously endorsed by the Philadelphia Conference in 1869. (See also the interesting controversy between Holdheim, Wechsler and Einhorn in the *Israelit des XIX. Jahrh.*, 1848.)

THE BEGINNINGS OF EINHORN'S PRAYERBOOK.

As may be imagined, the breach between the radicals and the conservatives which existed in Holdheim's time was not healed after Einhorn had taken this stand against the circumcision rite. All the more were his energies bent upon securing equal rights and liberty of worship to both Reform and Orthodoxy, by a revision of the Synagogue statutes with a view of maintaining unity and peace in communities in which the Orthodox minorities held out threats of secession. Each synagogue should provide for both an Orthodox and a Reform Service, the former to take place earlier than the other, while on the two great autumnal holy days a special hall should be placed at the disposal of the minority. The official report of the Directorate whose head Einhorn was, bitterly deplores both the religious apathy and the dissension among the Jewish communities which cause desolation of the synagogues and the decline of all religious life, and appeals to all parties to co-operate in the work of revival by the creation of a Synod. It also holds out the promise of a religious re-awakening, of the introduction of a prayerbook based upon the principles adopted by the

Frankfurt Conference which, while embodying the essential portions of the old ritual, will strongly emphasize the idea of Israel's election for a Messianic mission for mankind, so that Reform will cease to be looked upon as a mere negation of the old system, but become recognized as a positive faith, appealing alike to the mind and the soul and which in its innermost being is truly conservative. "The task set before us," says Einhorn, "is not an easy one, and requires long deliberation, especially insofar as the ardent longing for Zion and the lofty spirit of resignation in view of all the suffering and shame of the centuries past, lent to the Jewish liturgy such rare power of elevation and buoyant hope and such wondrous charm. We must therefore find the adequate form for it in our Messianic hope and not allow it to be absorbed by our aspirations for political emancipation and civic equality." Until this work is completed, he recommends the provisional use of the prayer-book of Dr. Meyer of Stuttgart.

We thus find Einhorn laying out the plan for his prayer-book as early as 1849, and traces of that time are discernible in both the Prayer at the Naming of a Child and in the Grace at Meals in which the covenant seal of the spirit is accentuated in place of "the seal on the flesh," which term, as a matter of fact, places the religious equality of the Jewesses in jeopardy. In a New York sermon of 1870, Einhorn declared that only the Sabbath bears the name of Sign of the Covenant in the Mosaic legislation, while the Abrahamitic sign is not mentioned as a fundamental law. Beyond that, Einhorn did not go. He never, even in his private correspondence, as did Geiger, declared it to be "a barbarous custom that ought to be abolished." He was at all times a constructive, not a destructive, reformer.

CONFLICT WITH ORTHODOXY.

Still, his efforts to maintain unity and peace failed. The Orthodox petitioned the government for separation. Dr. Einhorn, as head of the Jewish Directorate (Oberrath), in an exhaustive reply to the charge of disloyalty to tradition as

shown in the liturgical reforms, pointed out that, first of all, such prayers as are the outcome of ages of intolerance and are unbecoming an age of liberty and toleration have to be eliminated; that such prayers as express the hope of a restoration of the sacrificial cult and of an Israelitish kingdom upon the soil of Palestine no longer voice the sentiment of the large majority of Jews in civilized countries. In its place the hope is cherished of a time when the Messianic mission of Israel will find its full realization in the equal recognition and mutual esteem of all men before God, their common Father. And, finally, the spirit of true devotion can not be fostered by the exclusive use of a foreign and little understood language, such as the Hebrew has become for the larger portion of modern Israel; instead, the use of the vernacular in the main is demanded. The fact that compulsion to accept the Reform cult is nowhere exerted, but perfect freedom and choice of the form of worship is granted to all who still adhere to the traditional practice, ought to prevent the latter from declaring war, when the hand of peace and reconciliation has been offered, especially as the aim and object of all reform measures has only been the preservation of the imperiled life of Judaism. (See *Allgem. Zeitung des Judenth.*, 1850, p. 74f., and 1851, p. 543.) This occurred in January, 1850. The conservatives were supported in their opposition to Reform by the Government, no doubt greatly influenced by the Christian Church, and Einhorn, realizing that his position was being more and more undermined, accepted a call from the Reform Congregation at Pesth, in October of 1851; his successors in Mecklenburg-Schwerin were strictly orthodox Rabbis, such as Lipschuetz, S. Cohn and Feilchenfeld.

EINHORN IN PESTH.

In order fully to appreciate the brief but brilliant period of Dr. Einhorn's work at the helm of the Reform Congregation of Pesth, which, as I know from authentic sources, was like the flashing up and fading away of a meteor on the sky, one

must cast a swift glance at the conditions among the Jews of Hungary, which are excellently portrayed in Dr. David Philipson's *History of the Reform Movement*, Chapter X. The conflict between Orthodoxy and Reform was more bitter there than elsewhere, as the one actually meant a Ghettoism opposed even to the political and social emancipation, whereas the other identified itself with the Hungarian revolution, and when the latter was crushed by the Austrian Government, the semi-liberals, in order to save themselves, disowned and denounced Reform as revolutionary. The effervescent young Jewish Magyars set up a Reform program which, like that of the Frankfurt Reform Verein, aimed at the overthrow of the entire Jewish past with its religious traditions and practices. The revolutionary year 1848 saw the formation of the Reform Congregation in Pesth modelled after Holdheim's Congregation in Berlin, divine service to be held on Sunday instead of on the historical Sabbath, prayers to be recited in the vernacular, the men sitting with uncovered heads, and the Abrahamic rite as well as the dietary laws no longer to be observed. Ignatz Einhorn, an able journalist in the service of the revolution, a former Yeshiba Bachur, then twenty-four years of age, was elected Rabbi, but was compelled to leave Pesth the following year when the Hungarian revolution had proved a failure. The petition of the Reform Congregation for a special charter was refused by the Austrian Minister of Public Worship on the ground that the Government could not encourage the formation of new sects having no positive dogmas affirming the belief in a Supernatural Being. In this chaotic state the one man to whom all eyes turned for energetic aid and for wisdom and powerful guidance to concentrate the liberal forces and give them a clear, positive and firm religious character and purpose, was Holdheim's friend and peer, David Einhorn. While in full sympathy with radical reform in its endeavor to free the spirit of Judaism from all its trammels, Biblical or rabbinical, he was determined to build up, not to tear down, to plant, not to destroy. A positive Judaism, liberal yet loyal to its past,

was to be inculcated in the hearts and minds of those who had gone to the very extreme in their assertion of religious independence. His inaugural sermon, delivered in January, 1852, before a large expectant multitude, was as eloquent in what it ignored, as it was in what it emphatically declared. No allusions were made to the Sabbath transfer or to the questions that were uppermost in the minds of the radicals. On the other hand, it placed the seal of approval in the name of Rabbinism upon praying with uncovered heads and in the vernacular, or with the accompanying organ peal. Such external reforms, however, he said, are valueless unless they regenerate Judaism in Synagogue, school and in the life of the Jew, to make the hearts torn asunder by inner discord whole again. Seeing the holiest and loftiest in our faith mocked at by the one, and unscrupulously cast aside by the other, we stand in opposition to both, while striving again to make religion a vital and hallowing force as in days of yore. For ours is not that shallow rationalism which sees not beyond the limit of its own horizon. We stand upon the sublime and immovable rock of divine revelation and of a four-thousand year old history. To us the Mosaic Law is, if not in the letter, certainly as to its spirit, divine, an ever-progressive educational power, destined to lift humanity in the course of centuries to that lofty pinnacle of moral and religious perfection, which by far outshines our modern culture. And just for this reason we believe in the continuous development of Mosaism, in the mere temporary value of its ceremonies. We claim for our age the same power of changing and abrogating the Biblical laws as had the old-time Rabbis. The Talmud is for us by no means divine, but a treasure-house full of divine truth, developed from out of the ancient kernel. Such a precious possession is, for instance, the belief in Immortality. It is our task so to further develop Judaism into an ever more vigorous life, as the grain of seed sprouts forth into richer fruitage when buried in the soil. Just as Rebecca in her anguish at the strife of her two children in the womb, heard the voice of God saying:

"Thou wilt give birth to two peoples, of whom the one will be stronger than the other, and the older will serve the younger," so does the Jewish Synagogue today receive from God the reassuring message that the present convulsion in her midst will not lead to her death, but to a higher religious life, to the realization of her hopes and ideals, in which the older brother will serve the younger in bringing about the great future. This sermon was not, as the hotspurs expected, a declaration of independence from the past, but an assurance of loyalty to Judaism. In this spirit Einhorn expected to undo the mischief wrought and revive the Jewish consciousness, where anarchy and lack of principle had threatened to extinguish it. Success seemed to reward his endeavors. Men and women of wealth and culture and of social eminence came to listen to the eloquent preacher who then stood at the very zenith of his power, preaching with the fire of an Elijah and the tongue of an Isaiah before crowded houses each Sunday. Alas, his very success alarmed the fanatics, filled Chief-Rabbi Schwab with enmity, and the Austrian Government with fear. In vain did Einhorn plead with the Minister of Public Worship for permission to continue a work which was the very reverse of revolutionary. Both the name of Reform and the name of Einhorn were sufficient to cause the Government to turn a deaf ear to his petition. Two months after his inauguration, the fate of the congregation was sealed, the temple was closed. His enemies had triumphed.

Still Dr. Einhorn was by no means disheartened by this crushing defeat. Though watched by Government officials, because he had been denounced by the conservatives as a revolutionary, he remained in Pesth among friends who adored the man and admired his lofty spirit, which even in his bitter disappointment remained uncrushed. Here he began working at a system of Jewish theology, which he said would be different than any attempts thus far made by others. "We wish to know what Judaism is, not what it is not. The mere critical attitude helped in purging Judaism of its impure elements, but failed

to offer a true remedy for its recovery. We must leave the atmosphere of mere negation and find the vitalizing principles of a positive faith." In order to obtain a theological basis for Reform, Einhorn, in a work entitled "*Das Prinzip des Mosaismus und dessen Verhaeltniss zum Heidenthum und Rabbinischen Judenthum*," undertook to show that, in contrast to Rabbinism, for which the whole Law is the kernel and is of a binding character, the ceremonial laws, and particularly the sacrificial cult, which occupies a central position in Mosaism, is of a symbolic character and not essential. Beholding, in Moses, as he does, the divine law-giver and the highest among the prophets, in accordance with the Maimonidean articles, and believing the tabernacle with its sacrificial cult to be the actual work of Moses, he takes the latter and also the Biblical story of the beginnings of man, to contain divine truth in symbolic form. In the same light does he regard, though he accepts it, the theory of an Elohistic and Jahvistic source. Accordingly, he investigates the Biblical idea of God as expressed in the double name of Jahve and Elohim, the idea of man in his duality of body and soul, the idea of physical and moral evil in its relation to the world as the creation of the One and Holy God. He thus arrives at the conclusion that moral evil is man's own doing, since God, who in all holiness and the essence of all things, can not tolerate an evil power to thwart his plan of life. Man, therefore, being made in God's image is by nature pure and can of his own accord regain his former state of purity by repentance without the mediation of priesthood or of atonement by blood.

The rite of purification or atonement by sacrifice, consequently can only have a symbolic character, but is not essential to man's restitution to his original pure state, as is assumed by both Rabbinism and Paulinian Christianity. The latter, in demanding the blood of a divine saviour, has resuscitated paganism, whereas the former puts suffering in exile in the place of the sacrifice which is suspended for the time being.

This work, indicating the influence of Kreuzer's and Baehr's

symbolism, remained unfinished. The first volume of 238 pages appeared in Leipzig in 1854; a few chapters of the second volume on Free Will and Divine Providence were published by the author in the *Sinai*, vi. 334f, and the *Jewish Times* of 1872. The very name of Mosaism evidences the older standpoint of Bible criticism.

Of far greater value than the work itself was Einhorn's effort at the concentration of all his energies in the direction of a creative theology during his involuntary leisure at Pesth. He felt called upon more than ever to be the herald of a constructive Reform, in a practical as well as in a theoretical sense, and he waited until the voice came to him as to Abraham: "Get thee out of thy country, from thy kindred and from thy father's house unto the land that I shall show thee."

DAVID EINHORN IN BALTIMORE.

David Einhorn came to America in 1855, in response to a call from the Har Sinai Congregation of Baltimore, buoyed up by the conviction that the free land of America, in which a broad, humanitarian spirit, reason and common sense reigned in place of blind authority-worship, fanaticism and despotism—would offer the proper soil and scope for the full realization of his ideal. Here he hoped to rear a Reform Judaism freed of its obstructions and useless scaffoldings, glorious in its simple yet sublime truth. A renowned scholar, an accomplished Reform theologian, he came with a message not heard before. He spoke, not as a preacher, the popular leader, or the philosopher, but as the prophet of Reform Judaism in the language and in the spirit of Germany, the fatherland of Reform. Herein lay his unique strength, but also his limitation. He shared the destiny of all prophets; he was not understood except by comparatively few. Both conservatives and liberals dreaded the Radical Reformer who was so fearless in living up to his convictions and in condemning hypocrisy, whether in the pulpit or in daily life.

Great and creditable work, certainly, had been accomplished by the high-aiming pioneers of Reform, such as Poznanski, Merzbacher, Lilienthal and Isaac M. Wise. Especially the latter, with the wonderful indomitable energy and perseverance that distinguished him, and his mighty powers of tongue and pen, had fought against the abuses and excrescences of ritualistic orthodoxy, and after severe struggles and trials had won the people for a remodelled synagogue worship and for broad and liberal views of Judaism. The soil had been ploughed and made susceptible for the seeds of enlightenment and progress, for a Reform that brought out the best and the highest in the American Jew. But it was the result of incessant toil and a matter of slow growth. Now all of a sudden these Reform efforts should be precipitated by one so outspoken and so aggressive as Dr. Einhorn was reputed to be. Were the Congregations under their charge prepared and ripe for Einhorn's radicalism? Such, I think, were the considerations that induced Drs. Wise, Merzbacher and Lilienthal to antagonize the newcomer and to form a coalition at Cleveland in 1855 with the conservatives by declaring the Talmud to be the authoritative interpreter of the Bible and therefore binding upon the Jew—a mistake which was most serious in its consequences. Moreover, the long, protracted strife between Wise and Einhorn, between the West and the East, which followed, finds its best explanation in this deplorable misunderstanding of the lofty aims and principles of Einhorn and his conception of Reform Judaism.

Einhorn was providentially destined to give clearness of thought, consistency of purpose and firmness of principle to the entire Reform movement in America. His was that tremendous earnestness which seemed like that of Elijah to bring down fire from heaven, to make believer or unbeliever alike bend the knee before the majesty of God on high. With courage undaunted he laid bare the hollowness and hypocrisy of ceremonialism and the conceit and arrogance of atheism, insisting all the more upon the essence of faith, the kernel

of Judaism. His inaugural sermon delivered on September 27, 1855, has lost nothing of its inspiring and electrifying power after fifty-four years. In it he accentuates the contrast between the perishable body and the imperishable spirit of divine law. "The former," he says, "consists in forms intended to serve as signs and symbols, or as an armor of protection for the eternal truth, which must constantly differ in accordance with the stage of culture attained, and the outward conditions and relations of Israel to the surrounding nations. The other is the religious and moral truth as expressed in its fundamentals in the decalogue of Sinai, destined to become through Israel the common possession of mankind. Our pious fathers identified, nay, confounded, the form with the essence, applying the standard of legalism even to the laws of morality. Praying and hoping for a restoration of the long antiquated sacrificial cult, they clung to lifeless customs which dulled their religious and moral sense. We have come to a turning point. Our entire religious and moral life is imperiled. Mere outward forms which render the service more attractive are of no avail. They merely hide the inner decay. Judaism must be reformed from within. The evil which threatens to absorb all the wholesome vigor and marrow must be remedied at the root. Whatever is in a state of decay and has lost its hold on the people must be taken out of the system in order that the religious life be made whole again and healthy. Lest our children emancipate themselves from Judaism altogether, we must emancipate Judaism from such shackles as tend to corrupt the inner life. But in removing the scaffolding we must be careful not to tear down the structure. We want to build up. We do not lack piety. Profound reverence for our religious sanctuary dictates our steps and should direct us to concentrate our energies all the more fully and single-heartedly upon the essence of the divine law which is far above the changes of time and place, and which will remain in force, even though the earth wax old like a garment, and the heavens vanish like smoke. We want no self-created cult, no Judaism modelled to suit our taste, no stripping

off of Jewish characteristics, no straying away into the empty void. No, on the contrary, we want an Israelitism with all its distinctions sharply brought out as rooted in Sinai, and destined to bring forth new blossoms and fruitage upon the lofty height of a four thousand years' history.

"Standing upon the immovable ground of divine revelation, we must turn our entire attention to our system of belief. . The more the ceremonial laws lose of importance and dominion, the more necessary is a comprehension of the Jewish faith in its uniqueness as the fountain of our strength, the cause of our endurance throughout the centuries. For ours is the belief in God, the Only One, who reveals himself particularly in man as the all-pervading immanent Spirit; ours the belief in the innate goodness and purity of all things and particularly of those beings created in the divine image whose power of self-sanctification is never interfered with by any other force and who need no other mediation for redemption than their own free will. Ours is the belief in one human family, whose members, all being made alike and endowed with the same claim and title to happiness, will all participate in the bliss of that glorious time when the blood-stained purple of earthly kings will forever be consigned to the grave, together with all the garnished lies, selfishness and persecution, and God alone will rule as King over all the nations who will become the one people of God. These doctrines, first presented in the garb of a specific Jewish nationality, in order that man should not be dazzled by the splendor of their sublime truth, are still the proud possession of Israel and its hope for the future. These doctrines enshrine treasures of world-redeeming thoughts, and it is our sacred task to unfold and apply them to the realities of life and enrich thereby the heart and the soul. As to the ceremonies, they are to be held sacred and inviolable as long as they awaken religious thought and sentiment. Symbolic expressions of our relation to God are needed all the more, as Judaism rigidly forbids symbolic presentations of the deity itself. Our Judaism is the religion of the God whose name

is *Ehyeh*, "I shall be," not a faith imprisoned behind Ghetto walls, not a widow mourning for Zion and Jerusalem, but a bride adorned for the wedding with humanity. To nurture this spirit of Judaism we have new clasped hands and we have no reason to doubt the success of our endeavor as many splendid forces have begun to work in this same sense and no obstacles will be thrown in our path from without."

THE CLEVELAND CONFERENCE.

However, the sound of these mighty utterances had hardly died away when the local and Jewish press of America brought the astounding news that at a Conference in Cleveland called "in the name of Jehovah by a Provisory Sanhedrin," a platform was unanimously adopted by the most prominent rabbis of America declaring that "all Israelites agree upon the divinity of the Bible and that the Talmud is acknowledged by all as the legal and obligatory commentary of the Bible," or, according to an amended form: "The Bible as delivered to us by our fathers is of immediate divine origin and the standard of our religion; the Talmud contains traditional legal and logical exposition of the Biblical laws, which must be expounded and practiced according to the comments of the Talmud." (*New York Herald*, November 20, 1855; *American Israelite*, October 26, and November 9, 1855; *Sinai*, 1856, pp. 25-26.)

Thus the entire work of Reform and Progress was with one stroke condemned in principle by the very men who had thus far been its champions. Einhorn and his congregation recognized this as a declaration of war against the principles of Reform they stood for; accordingly, they sent forth a fulminant protest against the Cleveland Platform, showing, in a circular letter, dated November 6, the incompatibility of the same with all that medieval and modern rabbinical authorities have written and with all that the very men who proposed and signed the declaration had thus far done and taught. Soon Temple Emanu-El Congregation of New York sided with Einhorn

against Dr. Merzbacher, their own Rabbi, prominent Reform Rabbis of Germany joining in the protest.*

THE "SINAI."

In February, 1856, the first number of Einhorn's monthly, "*Sinai*," made its appearance as the organ of Reform Judaism, having for its motto the words: "My brethren do I seek." It is not in the interest of American Judaism today to revive the spectres of the past. It must be stated here, however, and I state it for the sake of God's truth, that the very first article by Dr. Einhorn in the *Sinai* on the attitude of modern Judaism towards the Talmud can not have been understood correctly by Dr. Wise when he in his protest published in "*The American Israelite*" of February 15, characterized it "as a slanderous and false presentation of Jews and Judaism by an enemy of both." The article in question is based upon the most profound insight into the history of Rabbinism, as first opened up by the epoch-making works of Abraham Geiger, as is expressly stated. Far from maligning the Talmud, it points out in terms of warm appreciation the great progress and reform unconsciously or consciously wrought by it, while at the same time it exposes in sharp outlines the formalism and the soulless legalism, which underlie its Halakic system. It contains nothing that Dr. Wise himself did not later on, as President of the Pittsburgh Rabbinical Conference, subscribe to. And this is the point where justice must be done by all of us here to the great achievements of David Einhorn for American Reform Judaism. He was not the organizing genius, nor the master-builder of American Judaism Wise was destined to be; but he was the profound and clear-sighted German scholar and Reform theologian, whose providential task it was to educate the liberal-minded American laity as well as leaders by his insistence on principles and by his sledgehammer blows, to wrest

Note.—In Meyer Stern's history of Temple Emanu-El it is stated that Dr. Merzbacher had not arrived at the Conference till after the platform had been adopted.

recognition from them for his well elaborated Reform system. His articles on the various theological issues of the day in the seven volumes of the "*Sinai*" are a mine of profound thoughts for the student. What militates against their value is that they are written in ponderous German and frequently in most involved sentences, placing them beyond the comprehension of the average reader.

THE PRAYERBOOK.

And here I touch upon a most important point: Reform Judaism, as has been said by way of reproach, is a German importation. This is true. The men unfamiliar with German philosophy and philology and uninfluenced by a Lessing, by Mendelssohn and Schiller, by Kant and Hegel, can to this very day have no real understanding of the development of the leading principles of Reform Judaism. They lack the deeper insight into the historic forces that ever create new currents of thought and cause the changes affecting religious views, in common with the general world-view (*Weltanschauung*). Some are naive enough to admire Geiger and Zunz for their vast erudition while condemning critical-historical Bible research as conducive to Paulinianism.

The Reform Movement in America, just as in Germany, was started by laymen imbued with German ideas. A few followed these, led by their common sense in discarding superfluous and burdensome usages. The rest, forming the great majority, clung to traditions and practices of their parental home, scarcely knowing what they meant, and preferred the old Hebrew sing-song, however little understood, to prayers in the vernacular which they could comprehend. Naturally these latter would have to be led forward gradually to appreciate the religious needs of the new era and chime in with the Reform principles. This then became the main issue between Isaac M. Wise, the born leader of the masses, whose first and foremost aim was to Americanize the Jew in the new land of his

adoption and therefore wanted to make haste slowly in his Reform work, and David Einhorn, who would not give up one iota of his Reform principles, be the number rallying around his banner never so small. Hence, the former worked and agitated for his Minhag America, that is, a revised form of the old prayerbook in which, exactly as was done by the Hamburg Temple, by Meyer of Stuttgart, Stein, Geiger, Merzbacher and others, the references to the sacrificial cult and the Messiah were here and there expunged and expressions hostile to heretics and foes of Israel were modified. Einhorn, however, stepped forth with a prayerbook, all made of one piece, all conceived and written in the spirit of reform, the work of a religious genius, a veritable treasure-house of inspiring thought, a production embodying the best elements of the ancient ritual and at the same time voicing the deepest yearnings and longings of the modern Jew—and all this in the language of an Isaiah and in the lyric strains of the Psalmists and the great mediaeval bards. Such was Einhorn's Olath Tamid, the prayerbook for the Israelitish Reform Congregations, which made its first appearance in Baltimore in May, 1856, and came out in complete form in 1858. It was hailed by the progressive German Jews, first of Baltimore, then of Philadelphia and afterwards of Chicago and elsewhere, as a new revelation, as a God-sent interpreter of the religious consciousness of the modern Jew.

As Einhorn stated in his preface, all the other Reform prayerbooks removed the old familiar formulas and features without replacing them by corresponding new ones expressive of the views and feelings of the modern Jew; whereas the precious thoughts handed down in the old ritual are preserved here in spiritualized form. No ambiguity as to words here, no halting between two opinions. Every lie uttered in prayer is blasphemy before God's throne, be it the antiquated belief in resurrection or the hope for the return to Jerusalem. A Reform prayerbook must, in clear, unmistakable accents, give utterance to what the Jew in our advanced state of thought really believes and fervently feels. The only Reform ritual

which previously attempted to do this was that of the Berlin Reform Congregation, used also by the Reform Congregation of Pesth; yet it, too, had its great deficiencies, says Einhorn. It lacks the pulsations of the Jewish heart. It appeals to reason, rather than to the soul. It fails to echo forth the pangs and longings of the Jew in the past, remorse-stricken at his sins in view of the unequalled sufferings he was undergoing, while torn away from his ancestral home. And herein lies the great merit of Einhorn's ritual. It voices the spirit of ancient Israel as it lives in the new age and in the religious consciousness of the modern Jew. The glow of love is there, and reverence and loyalty to the past permeates the whole, while the new demands are fully recognized. Weeping over the glory of days gone by is transformed into outbursts of thanksgiving and joy over the dawn of the new day of promise and of hope for both Israel and humanity. Einhorn began this great immortal work in Schwerin and worked at it during his involuntary leisure in Pesth; but only the invigorating air of free America lent his genius the wings to soar to the heights of prophetic vision to compose the classic prayerbook for the liberated Jew, who, instead of looking back to the land he once owned, would look forward with joyous hope to the future, thanking God for the land whose blessings of liberty and peace he enjoyed to the full. While adhering as far as possible to the main structure of the ancient liturgy as pointed out by Zunz, he made each service ring with the cheering note of thanksgiving for the doings of God in Israel's history. Particularly the Yom Kippur service peals forth in inimitable art the sublime truth of Israel's world-mission as the priest-people, and interprets, with a pathos that emanates from the innermost soul of the Jew, both the ancient and the modern idea of sin, repentance and divine forgiveness. The whole is the work of a master whose greatness is manifested in each detail. I refer to the Pesach Haggadah, for instance, which makes the festal home resound with the lessons of the entire history of Israel and with thanksgiving for the land of freedom inhabited

by the American Jew; to the selections of the Haftarah lessons for the triennial cycle, so suggestive to the Rabbi; and last but not least, to the wedding ritual which does away with the utterly repugnant Rabbinical formula in Hebrew and lends the ceremony a truly solemn character instead (See *Sinai* III, 1019). However, while it found many admirers and appreciative friends in German-speaking communities, such as Baltimore, Philadelphia, Chicago, New York, Pittsburg, St. Louis and others, it worked its way but slowly into the hearts of America's Jews owing to its German garb. In Einhorn's opinion, the triumph of the Reform ideas depended upon the preservation of the German language even for the rising generation. The consequence was that, despite the fact that Samuel Adler, the life-long friend and co-worker of Einhorn, had himself warmly recommended the Olath Tamid to the Sinai Congregation of Chicago as the only true Reform ritual (see his letter in *The Jewish Times*, 1871, p. 747), Temple Emanu-El of New York, his own congregation, would not part with Dr. Merzbacher's Hebrew ritual, with its oft-revised English translation alongside of it. At last one congregation after another raised the cry for a translation into English of the Einhorn ritual. The first attempt was a failure. The translation lacked the requirements of a prayerbook because the translator lacked the heart and the fervor of a religious soul. Dr. Hirsch's brilliant translation appeared as late as 1896. Meanwhile the Central Conference of American Rabbis decided to give the Union of American Hebrew Congregations a uniform prayerbook. This is not the place to relate the history of the uniform prayerbook. I for my part can not help saying that it was an adoption by organized American Reform Judaism of Einhorn's views when in 1894 the second volume of the Union Prayerbook, based upon Einhorn's ritual as submitted by the writer, was adopted by the Conference in Atlantic City under the presidency of Isaac M. Wise, who solemnly declared that in the interest of the union and consolidation of American Reform Judaism he was ready to part with his long cherished Minhag America and

adopt the new prayerbook instead. The first volume, worked out by Dr. Gottheil and the writer, with the assistance of Rabbi Maurice Harris, appeared the following year. Whatever shortcomings the Union Prayerbook, now in use in one hundred and fifty congregations of the land, may have, owing to the fact that it lacks the fire of genius and the uniqueness of style of its model, Einhorn's spirit will ever live in it and ever quicken anew the religious consciousness and devotion of the worshippers who use it, as no other ritual—aside from Dr. Hirsch's translation—can.

INCREASING INFLUENCE.

Einhorn's marvelous powers as pulpit orator and as writer were felt all over the land and in Germany as well. His articles in the "*Sinai*," both theological and polemical, as well as his sermons published there, enlightened the mind and clarified the air, branding hypocrisy and fanaticism as such in high or low places. Holdheim became a contributor until his death. Samuel Adler, who succeeded Merzbacher in New York, and Felsenthal in Chicago, rallied around him. The fine dialectician of the old Yeshibah days of Fuerth was too skillful a fighter to allow any of his antagonists to get the better of him. Young Dr. Szold, desiring to win his first spurs by publicly attacking Einhorn, had to pay dearly for having called him another Eisenmenger. (See *Sinai*, 1860, February number.) It is interesting to know that nearly twenty years after this bitter controversy, Einhorn in a letter to Felsenthal* writes: "Dr. Szold has been to see me; he has become one of my best friends."

EINHORN'S ANTI-SLAVERY AGITATION AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

In matters of principle Einhorn knew no fear, and the new land brought new trials and new martyrdom. For him the institution of slavery was not merely a social crime, a violation

NOTE.—Miss Julia Felsenthal has kindly placed at my disposal a collection of one hundred and sixty letters written to her father by Dr. Einhorn between 1856 and 1879 which are of decided interest.

of the American principle of liberty and human equality; it was the greatest possible crime against God in whose image man is made. What mattered it to him that slavery is tolerated in the Mosaic law. The spirit of the law condemned it, as it did polygamy or lynch law (death by the avenger), though the letter of the law seems to permit such primitive institutions. In unsparing terms of passionate indignation he upbraided the slave-holders of the South, and his enraged Jewish heart broke forth into effusions of horror at the fact that the Jew, who for centuries has been the slave of the ruling nations, should thus desecrate his faith as to keep up this shameful degradation of man. His fiercest shafts he aimed at the New York leader of Jewish Orthodoxy, Dr. Raphall, who dared in the name of Judaism, Mosaic and Talmudical, to defend the institution of slavery against the spirit voiced in the Deuteronomic law (xxiii, 16-17) in the Decalogue and in Job. Maryland being then a pro-slavery state, Einhorn's attitude was a most perilous one. As his name was on the list of those singled out for attack by the mob, he had to flee for his life during the middle of the night of the 19th of April, 1861, protected by a body-guard of friends.*

EINHORN IN PHILADELPHIA.

Unwilling to relinquish his self-imposed task as an anti-slavery preacher, rather than to return to Baltimore under conditions restraining his freedom of speech, he decided to settle down in Philadelphia. Here he immediately set to work to issue the new number of his *Sinai*, imbued with the old indomitable spirit of the heroic martyr. On the Fourth of July he delivered a sermon at the Keneseth Israel Temple resonant with hope for the triumph of the cause of the Union. The following month he was elected Rabbi of that Congregation. Speaking on Isaiah's beautiful Song of the Vineyard as his text, he demands of his new congregation not a reformed cult.

NOTE.—See article by Max J. Kohler on *Jews and the Anti-Slavery Movement in Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, Vol. V. p. 137 ff. and Vol. IX, p. 45 ff.

but a reformed Jewish heart, a reawakened religious consciousness, a reinvigorated belief in God and a restitution of the Sabbath, as Israel's tower of victory and of strength.

His *Sinai* maintained itself another year against the odds of the war, and then, after seven years of existence, as Einhorn wrote, "it died in the battle against slavery."

Of the personal sacrifices he brought for the cause he championed and the bodily suffering caused by the great ordeal he went through since the terrible night of mob rule in Baltimore, a few letters written to Dr. Felsenthal tell their touching tale. But there was some compensation for him in the thought that his championship of the cause of abolition was recognized by the non-Jewish world, as was shown by his election as Honorary Member of the Philadelphia Union League Club; also in that his Thanksgiving day sermon of 1863 was published in English for the benefit of the Sanitary Commission, a semi-governmental relief agency during the Civil War. Indeed, if anyone, Einhorn was the true American patriot, pouring out his very soul for the Union and the glorious institutions of America. His sermons, delivered on the great national festivals and fast-days, betray an ardent love for the land of his adoption, such as only a lofty idealist could cherish for the Republic; yet in the same measure as he strikes the highest note of jubilant joy when enlarging on the great destiny of the nation, he also holds a mirror up to the people to fill them with shame at their great backsliding and sins which threaten to lead them to woe and ruin. Great was his admiration for Washington; still more was his heart set aglow by the doings of Abraham Lincoln, the liberator of a race, and his eulogy on the saintly martyr is one of the finest tributes offered in any tongue to the dead hero. He permitted no occasion to pass without acknowledging the providential task of the American people to promote human greatness. His sermon on the new Atlantic cable interlinking the two hemispheres is a masterly panegyric, thrilling the reader, as it undoubtedly must have the hearer, with joy and pride at the new triumph of man over nature.

NER TAMID.

Einhorn devoted his untiring faculties, though with an enfeebled physique, to the working out of his theological system so as to make it accessible to teachers. After he had, in an exhaustive and suggestive criticism of Holdheim's Catechism, pointed out the deficiencies of the otherwise valuable work, he realized the need of supplying one more in accordance with his own principles. So he published the *Ner Tamid* ("The Ever-burning Lamp"), which was to contain "The Teachings of Judaism for School and Home." Most characteristic therein is his conception of revelation and prophecy. The former is to him eminently a human faculty, attained by visions and dreams as well as by the grasp of the intellect, and in the prophet it assumes a higher and clearer form. In Moses the prophetic power attained its highest degree, the mercy-seat with the two cherubim—types of the mystery of the divine spirit—being the sacred spot at which he received his inspiration. Adam represents the original revelation, perpetuated in the Noahitic covenant with its humanitarian laws. The patriarchs, Abraham at their head, represent a higher revelation, the Abrahamic Covenant, with circumcision as sign but not a condition of membership. The highest revelation is represented by Moses. The name *Ehyeh* (I am the One Who Is), the declaration of Israel as God's first-born son, the Passover feast, the consecration of the first-born and the Sabbath day lead up to the Sinai revelation with its Ten Words, the foundation of the entire moral order of the world. The Bible, comprising the whole of Mosaism, was in the course of centuries to be developed and transformed into Judaism in the same measure as the spirit triumphed over the letter, and new institutions liberated the former ever more from the shackles of the latter. Israel, being God's missionary, must retain its separateness as priest-people until its mission is fulfilled; wherefore the non-Israelite should not be encouraged to join it unless he evidences a strong desire to espouse its faith from inner conviction. As the Hellenistic period, the birth of Christianity and Islamism,

so do the great events of our own era form successive stages in the realization of Israel's Messianic hope.

Interesting it is to find the prohibition of partaking of blood, of fortune-telling, of mixing different species of seeds or animals, and of early burials emphasized, and on the other hand, sculpture of human forms, though expressly against Talmudism, permitted. The Sabbath as a day of rest is declared to be an eternal law, the choice of the seventh day, however, to be symbolical and therefore ceremonial in its nature. The fast on the Atonement Day is to symbolize the idea of man's dominion over the flesh, yet is by no means to work atonement for sin. Thus Einhorn combined rationalism with mysticism—Nahmanides with Maimonides.

EINHORN IN NEW YORK.

Beloved and adored as Einhorn was by his Philadelphia Congregation, he felt that the field there was not large enough for him. Philadelphia was, as it still is to some extent, the stronghold of orthodoxy which arrogated to itself a certain supremacy in Jewish affairs, and it endeavored to interfere with the progress of Keneseth Israel. Before long Leeser, its mouth-piece, was disarmed by Einhorn (*Sinai* VI, 175), but the citadel could not be stormed. When the Sinai Congregation of Chicago tendered a call to Einhorn he declined the position, but recommended Dr. Felsenthal instead. But when a Congregation in New York, with its large German-speaking population behind it, extended its call to him, though then a man of fifty-seven years, he concluded not to decline. His friend and co-worker in the Reform movement of Germany, Dr. Samuel Hirsch, of Luxemburg, accepted the offer to take charge of the Keneseth Israel pulpit, and Einhorn became the Rabbi of Adath Jeshurun Congregation of New York, where he began his work by dedicating its new Temple and introducing the Reform cult in conformity with his own ritual. In his inaugural sermon, delivered at the end of August, 1866, speaking of Synagogue, religious school and religious practice, he presents these in the

picture of a living and life-quickenng well; and there he at once urged the need of a Jewish High School in the metropolis to form a solid foundation for a future Theological Seminary for the Jews of America. "Let New York's successful Jews be the Zebulon, the man of means who comes to the assistance of Issachar, the man of learning, to build up a seat of the Torah, a fountain of learning."

A HEBREW COLLEGE.

It may surprise some of you to hear that for years the idea of starting a Hebrew College was in Einhorn's mind. His correspondence with Felsenthal refers to such a plan again and again. The presence of Samuel Adler, in New York, and the fact that a number of other scholars, among them old friends from Germany, could assist him in these endeavors, encouraged him in the hope of doing work on a larger scale for the promotion of Jewish learning in America. In 1869 he had finally succeeded in securing the co-operation of Dr. Samuel Adler and other prominent men of Temple Emanu-El for his project, when differences regarding the management arose between him and the Temple Emanu-El representatives who were contributing the funds, and so the undertaking was dropped. The Temple Emanu-El Theological Association then took up the idea and decided to use the fund collected for a Preparatory School. Later on the fund was used for the support of theological students, and at present it helps to send students to the Hebrew Union College. Einhorn's interest in the cause was revived when Dr. Wise succeeded in enlisting the Jewish Congregations in the West for a Jewish Theological Institute, in the year 1872, and he waived all personal feelings in the matter when he accepted the chairmanship of the Committee on the Course of Studies for the Hebrew Union College, and met the other members of the Committee, Wise, Lilienthal and Hirsch, in Philadelphia, in 1876. It may be stated here also that it was Einhorn chiefly who encouraged

Dr. Mielziner to accept the offer of the chair of Talmud at the College in Cincinnati in 1879.

THE PHILADELPHIA CONFERENCE AND THE "JEWISH TIMES."

In the spring of 1874 Einhorn witnessed the triumph of his cause when the oldest German Jewish congregation of New York, Congregation Anshe Chesed, amalgamated with his own, to become one of the leading Jewish Congregations of the land under the name of Temple Beth-El, and the beautiful new edifice erected by the former congregation became the attractive center of his enlarged activity. Like Jacob, he thanked God in the opening prayer offered before his inaugural sermon that, having come to this land a pilgrim, with God as his staff, he was now privileged to see two camps united under his leadership. At last he had reached the goal of his life-long pilgrimage. His power as a master-mind of Reform Judaism in America was recognized. He felt that the time was ripe for propagating in larger circles the ideas and principles for which he had fought thus long. Yet in order to successfully do this, he wanted a periodical for a wider circle than the *Sinai* had been, but to espouse the same outspoken views. Accordingly, "*The Jewish Times*" was launched forth in 1869, with Moritz Ellinger as editor, and Einhorn, Adler, Samuel Hirsch, Felsenthal, Lilienthal, Dr. E. M. Friedlein and others as contributors. Its articles, brimful of Jewish learning and original ideas, gave evidence of new zeal and vigorous mentality; but the main purpose which guided Einhorn in promoting the enterprise was to prepare the way for concerted action through the instrumentality of rabbinical conferences. In the very same year a conference of Rabbis destined to become famous under the name of Philadelphia Conference was called by Einhorn, in conjunction with Adler, to take place at Philadelphia in November. Wise and Lilienthal attended and worked hand in hand with the two New York leaders, and with Hirsch, Felsenthal, Mielziner and others. The principles framed and submitted by Einhorn were unanimously adopted.

They formed the basic union of American Reform Judaism and consolidated the ideas of religious progress both as to the form of divine service and the rabbinical functions outside of the Synagogue. They defined the main issues of Reform Judaism in (a), declaring the Messianic hope to be universalistic and not national, and Israel's dispersion over the globe to have the fulfillment of its world-mission for its object, and not punishment for sin, as was the rabbinical view; (b), consigning the sacrificial cult together with the Aaronitic priesthood and the belief in resurrection of the body to the past, and accentuating the selection of Israel as the priest-people of humanity and the belief in immortality; and finally; (c), urging the necessity of having a large portion of the prayers in the vernacular, in view of the unfamiliarity of the average Jew or Jewess with the Hebrew. A number of the other resolutions adopted aimed to do away once for all with the entire Oriental view of woman's subjection to man as embodied in the traditional marriage and divorce laws, recommending a wedding formula expressive of the sanctity of marriage and abrogating the Get and the Halitzah. Besides all these they declared the son of a Jewish mother, though uncircumcised, to be a full Jew in every respect, as is the case with the daughter. Dr. Wise's proposition to admit proselytes without circumcision, Einhorn opposed for the reason that Judaism is not a proselytizing religion and desires to admit only such elements as would join it from a purely religious motive.

The Conference impressed the Jewish world on both sides of the Atlantic with its earnestness and positiveness as being the real heir and successor to the Rabbinical Conferences of Brunswick, Frankfurt and Breslau. It formed the basis for the Rabbinical Conference afterwards held under Dr. Wise's Presidency at Pittsburgh in 1885.

Still, not all the congregations were as yet ready to endorse the views and principles advocated by their Rabbis. Especially the resolution concerning the admission of the uncircumcised Jewish child into the Jewish fold created a feeling of unrest,

and in their timidity some of the Rabbis almost disavowed their utterances. Einhorn then delivered a series of lectures in his pulpit and had them published in the *Jewish Times* elucidating and defending the principles whose sponsor he had been with all the zeal that made his every word so forcible. The old feud was renewed. The former feeling of mistrust again alienated East and West. The contemplated next conference at Cincinnati did not take place. (See *Jewish Times*, 1870, p. 421.)

And when at a conference held in Cincinnati in 1871 a member—afterwards unmasked as a renegade and apostate—openly denied the existence of a personal God and of the value of prayer and found defenders instead of meeting with rebuke, new cause was given for vigorous dissent and firm protest. The old wounds would not heal. The time for real union and harmony had not come. There was something of that fiery impatience in Einhorn that made him stand out like Elijah crying forth: "I have been jealous for Thee, O Lord of Hosts;" something of the vigor of Moses, whose maxim was: "Let the mountains quake, but let the truth prevail!" Einhorn's life principle was: First Truth and then Peace. Wise's maxim was more like that of the German statesman who said: First Unity and then Liberty; and it was at the Cincinnati Conference of 1873 that the foundation was laid for the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

THE INTERMARRIAGE QUESTION.

Einhorn stood on his watch-tower, unyielding, uncompromising, no longer decried as the radical but rather pointed at with amazement as the rigorous conservative. Already in his debates with Holdheim he had in the most emphatic manner expressed his antagonism to intermarriage. In his opinion the Jewish people form a religious nation consecrated for its Messianic mission by the divine truth entrusted to it and by the blood of its martyrs. This priestly sacredness would be infringed upon by intermingling with foreign elements unless

the same give incontestable evidence of their espousal of the Jewish faith from sincere conviction. Samuel Hirsch on the other hand sided with Holdheim in favor of mixed marriages, as aiding in the propagation of the Jewish faith, especially as Christianity can not be regarded as being on the same level with paganism regarding the Biblical prohibition of intermarriage. Over against these arguments adduced by Hirsch, Einhorn in an article in the *Jewish Times* declared that "mixed marriages are the nail in the coffin of the small Jewish race." In his opinion the Jewish people is a religious nationality without any social or political character, a religious body held together solely by its religious views and hopes, but to remain apart from the rest of mankind as long as its mission of preserving and propagating its truth for mankind has not been fulfilled.

OTHER ISSUES OF THE DAY.

In regard to the Levirate law, Einhorn took the view, against Dr. Wise, Dr. E. Cohn of San Francisco, and also of Dr. Geiger, that the Biblical command to marry the widow of the deceased brother who has been left childless in order to beget a child bearing the brother's name can have no influence on our life, being in conflict with our entire conception of family life; consequently, the law prohibiting the marriage of the deceased brother's wife as incestuous remains in force like any other prohibition of incest, no matter whether she has children by her former husband or not.

During the latter years of his life Einhorn with growing anxiety observed the tide of skepticism and atheism threatening to engulf the rising generation. Especially the Ethical Culture movement caused him much grief, as it then started with a direct denial of God; and he thundered forth his warnings against this source of danger, insisting upon Israel's sublime truth as the soul and foundation of all ethics.

Einhorn never accepted the evolution theory nor the results of evolutionary Bible research, but he declared that Judaism is older than the Bible, it created the Mosaic and the Rab-

binical phase of Judaism and is now creating the phase of Reform Judaism.

GEIGER'S DEATH.

The news of Abraham Geiger's death, October, 1874, greatly affected Einhorn, and in the eulogy delivered in his pulpit he spoke from the text: "And God said: Let there be light!" to which the Midrash commenting thereon adds, "This is Abraham," and he remarked that "Geiger, the great light-bearer, the pathfinder and regenerator of Judaism, whose historical research brought light into the chaotic state of Jewish life and paved the way to true Reform, was blessed by God with all gifts of the spirit. Yet little was his greatness acknowledged by his generation. Ingratitude, disrespect and persecution is the lot of all prophets. To tower above the thousands and eclipse by true greatness vain and jealous mediocrity, is a crime for which death alone atones." It almost reads as if Einhorn here portrayed his own life.

"I AM A HEBREW."

At the approach of his seventieth year the veteran warrior in the cause of truth and progress felt that the time for rest had come. To the very last he impressed his hearers as the all-inspiring messenger of the Lord of Hosts, with an ever fresh message of heaven, but as his strength was failing, he decided to retire from office. In July, 1879, he delivered his farewell sermon, taking as his text the words: "I am a Hebrew," wherein he reviewed his eventful career, showing that these words had been his life motto. At the same time he urged upon his congregation the necessity of a periodical Sunday service in addition to the regular Sabbath service, the cultivation of German literature and German research as indispensable to healthy reform and progress, and finally, he accentuated most forcibly the universalistic character of Judaism against Felsenthal's then newly announced "Race Judaism." His con-

cluding word was a blessing for the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

He was not privileged long to enjoy the hoped for leisure. A few weeks after having read the Neilah Prayer on the Atonement Day following his retirement, he was summoned—a true high priest of the Most High—to the Holy of Holies of the celestial world. Had he lived another week he would have completed the three score years and ten allotted to man. However, he lived to see the word of Scripture verified; “If the ways of a man please the Lord, he maketh the heart even of his enemies to be at peace with him.” The representatives of the entire Jewish ministry of America, Reform and Orthodox, friend and foe, had united in tendering him resolutions expressive of their “appreciation of his life-long labors, of the ability and character which have marked his career, and the earnestness, honesty and zeal which have animated the heart of a man whom we proudly recognize as one of Israel’s purest champions and noblest teachers.” And among those who bestowed high praise on the great reformer was the editor of the “American Israelite.”

When the great master, Johanan ben Zakkai, the Reformer who led Israel through the period of transition from the ancient Temple to the sanctuary of the Synagogue and the School, departed this life, his disciples exclaimed: “O thou, the luminary of Israel, the right pillar and the mighty hammer!” Such indeed was David Einhorn, a light-bearer of truth, a breaker of idols, and above all, a pillar in firmness and uprightness, unbending and unyielding, a man true to the core.

They who have striven for the truth have entered the heavenly mansions of peace and we bless them all, saying with the psalmists: “Bless ye the Lord His messengers, valiant heroes in doing His bidding.” “They that are wise shine with the brightness of the firmament and like the stars forever and aye.”

Rabbi Landsberg—Mr. President and friends, I consider it a great honor that I shall have the privilege of adding a few remarks to the most beautiful and scholarly paper that we

have had the privilege of listening to. I am only sorry that the reader did not have time enough to read the whole of it. I wish to tell you that it is by my own request that I have been appointed as one of those who should lead in the discussion of this paper. Dr. Einhorn loved me like a father and I loved him like a son; he was one of the best friends I ever had in my life. When I was sent here nearly forty years ago through Dr. Geiger to try this country for one year he told me to go to Dr. Einhorn. That is what I did, and from the first day—of course I had read all that Dr. Einhorn had published before—I knew his wonderful spirit, but I did not know his amiable personality. He was not a man who would try to hurt the feelings of anyone, he would never do it, he would never think of it; what he tried to fight was one's principle, and especially where there was no principle; where there was sham, he tried to expose it bravely, fearlessly, without any selfish consideration. You have heard from this biography that you have just listened to how he was constantly working against his own worldly advancement. Now, it is utterly impossible to add anything to what has been said, it is utterly impossible to criticize anything, but after having expressed my admiration for the paper I will make a few remarks which are in my heart.

I think it was very graceful and very beautiful in our President to refer to it, that the differences of fifty years ago have disappeared. Why have they disappeared? If Einhorn on coming to this country had temporized, if Einhorn had agreed to statements that he considered false, because he believed in the noble nature of those who asserted them, you can depend upon it we would have today the same struggles over again. The differences of fifty years ago are obliterated. Why are they obliterated? For the same reason that the hostility between Einhorn and Dr. Wise was obliterated. Both of them were fighters. What did they have in common? Honesty of purpose. And what caused their fights? What did they have in common? *Kinath soferim*. It was *Kinath soferim*, which does not mean worldly wisdom, but means

that wisdom which wants to teach and to learn the truth, which unites great men, and which in the end caused Wise and Einhorn to become friends. Was it by surrendering principle? No, neither of them would have thought of it, but it was by recognizing that there was a common platform for them to stand on, and that platform was the advancement of all American Judaism, it did not make any difference what name it called itself—for who can deny that by the work of Einhorn and Wise and all the others, and even of Dr. Kohler also, that the orthodox have been compelled to advance, very frequently without being conscious of it. He laid down the principle of Judaism's capacity for continuous development. He stated the principle that reform did not begin from the congregations—I do not subscribe to that—from the congregations came indifferentism—that we have to complain of today, I am sorry to say, a great deal—but it came from these leaders of reform by whom the principles of reform were established, and then the people became conscious of the *right* of reforming the old Talmudic system. He was not only a fighter inside of the Jewish religion, but for the enlightenment of the world and in the cause of freedom. When those Methodist preachers who wanted to establish that slavery was right quoted the Bible, Einhorn fearlessly went into his pulpit, where he had before him men who were fattening on the slave trade, and said, "How can they slander Judaism like that? They go to the time of the flood to prove slavery is right; why don't they go further back? why don't they go back to the creation, where it says man is created in the image of God, and there is no distinction made between man and man?"

It is a beautiful coincidence that Dr. Einhorn's birthday falls on the same day on which fall the birthdays of Luther and Schiller, because he united the fighting powers of Luther with the spiritual insight and idealism of the great German poet. His sermons which have been published are full of poetic conceptions, which he often found in the driest biblical texts. He succeeded because he had a quality that ought to

succeed—his inside was like his outside, he never sided with both sides, he never tried to temporize, he never tried to make compromises. Unlike the politician, but like the true statesman, nobody had to ask him, "Where do you stand? What is your opinion on any great question of the day?" Everybody knew where he stood. He was a greater man in one respect than Luther, a greater man than all the reformers of the Christian world even to this day—they want to go back to the beginning of Christianity, he did not want to go back to the beginning of Judaism. He did not want to establish any firm principle—you have to stand, you can not move—but he advocated that great principle of Israel that Judaism has the capacity for continuous development, and he showed those who tried to imitate him how they should work. That we ought to take into constant consideration even if we do not agree with Einhorn's principles in every respect, but think we should go a little bit further beyond them.

Only those who are conversant with our history thirty or forty years ago can imagine what enthusiasm he aroused among the members of his congregation from Germany, who knew the Jewish religion only in its orthodox complexion and who had come here and had a previous education in other respects. It is to us a great lesson to study and to know the life of that man. All the differences of opinion have disappeared; we are all united, and I am delighted to see so many young rabbis—young enough to be my sons—who have come here to learn what this great and good man has done for our religion and our country. I hope that Dr. Kohler will enlarge upon his paper and will give us a full and complete biography of Dr. Einhorn, which ought to be published by the Central Conference of American Rabbis. I thank you.

C

INTERMARRIAGE HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

BY PROFESSOR EPHRAIM FELDMAN, CINCINNATI, O.

Casting a superficial glance at European and American societies and seeing how the members of the various nations and races freely intermarry; how Teuton, Celt, Scandinavian and Slav mingle their blood into one great European kinship, the Jew alone standing aloof, we are apt to get the impression that the Jew is a racial alien amidst the great European family of nations, and constitutes a problem unique in the world by virtue of his unique position in the matter of intermarriage. This impression contains two fundamental errors, which we must correct at the outset, if we are ever to see our problem in the proper light.

Let us begin, then, by pointing out that, much against appearances, intermarriage is not an exclusively Jewish problem. We are indeed a peculiar people, and many of our problems are decidedly and peculiarly our own, with hardly a parallel elsewhere; which circumstance makes their solution so peculiarly difficult. This is fortunately not the case with the problem before us. To see a phenomenon is one thing, to understand it, quite another. For that we need to study it in its widest manifestations both in space and time, i. e., historically. When we do that, we shall find, to begin with, that according to the sober testimony of history, the objection to intermarriage is no less than worldwide.

Beginning with the nations of classic antiquity, as those which we know best, we find that among the Greeks and Romans no citizen could marry a foreigner. "The foreigner," says Fustel de Coulanges, "could not be a proprietor, neither in Rome nor in Athens. He could not marry; or if he married, his marriage was not recognized, and his children were reputed illegitimate.

He could not make a contract with a citizen; at any rate the law did not recognize such a contract as valid. The Roman law forbade him to inherit from a citizen, and even forbade a citizen to inherit from him. They pushed this principle so far, that if a foreigner obtained the rights of a citizen without his son, born before this event, obtaining the same favor, the same became a foreigner in regard to his father, and could not inherit from him. The distinction between citizen and foreigner was stronger than the natural tie between father and son." Sponsors for these statements are Aristotle, Plato, Demosthenes, Lysias, Pausanias, Aristophanes, Gaius, Ulpian, Paulus, Cicero, etc., i. e., the most illustrious jurists, philosophers, poets, orators of classic antiquity.¹

In another branch of the Aryan family, amongst the Hindoos, the caste system is such a well known phenomenon as to hardly justify more than a bare reference to it. Though but sparingly found in the Vedahs, it pervades the Laws of Manu. Now, its fundamental idea is the absolutely impassable chasm between the different strata of Hindoo society. Intermarriage between the different castes pollutes not only the superior, but also the inferior caste. But this is not all. In addition to the four castes, which have at least legal status, there is a number of outcasts. Max Müller tells us² that in former times a Pariah was obliged to carry a bell (the very name Pariah is derived from the bell), in order to give warning to the Brahmans, who might be polluted by the shadow of an outcast. In Malabar, he further tells us, a Nayadi defiles a Brahman at a distance of seventy-four paces; and a Nayer, though himself a Sudra, would shoot one of these degraded races if he approached too near.

This horror of pollution through contact with a stranger is also to be met with in Modern Persia, as is testified by Baron Max von Thielmann, Secretary of the Imperial German Embassy at St. Petersburg, who traveled there as recently as 1875. In

¹ The Ancient City, bk. III, chap. XII, p. 262.

² Chips From a German Workshop, vol. II, p. 350.

his "Journey in the Caucasus, Persia and Turkey in Asia,"³ he tells us: "While the Sunnite is not deterred by his religious tenets from eating with a Christian, the Shiite reluctantly takes part in a meal in company with an unbeliever, and although possessing a natural inclination to hospitality, he is sufficiently fanatical to break in pieces the plates on which a Christian has been served, if he can not have them consecrated anew by a priest. I noticed no exception to this rule among the Shiites."

In his suggestions to the traveler⁴ he warns him "not to omit the necessary apparatus for eating and drinking, for the fanatical Shiite will not lend the Christian a plate or a goblet." It will be remembered that the Shiite, though a Moslem, is a heretical one, and more of a Persian than a Mohammedan.

That the dwindling colony of Parsees, that small remnant of ancient Zoroastrians, is also strictly endogamous, is also well known.

I dwell with special satisfaction on these data, as showing that the objection to intimate intercourse with the stranger, far from being a purely Jewish or even Semitic peculiarity, was, and still is, dominant in the most exaggerated form among all the members of the Aryan family of nations. The data on this question among the non-Aryan races are not easily accessible, but with regard to the Japanese, at least, we are better situated. In a letter addressed by Herbert Spencer to Baron Kaneko Kentaro, August 26, 1892,⁵ there occurs the following striking passage: "To your remaining question respecting the intermarriage of foreigners with Japanese, which you say is 'now very much agitated among our scholars and politicians,' and which you say 'is one of the most difficult problems,' my reply is that, rationally answered, there is no difficulty at all. It should be positively forbidden. It is not a root question of social Philosophy. It is a root question of Biology. There is

³ Vol. I, pp. 163, 164.

⁴ P. 277.

⁵ Published in the London *Times* of January 18, 1904, shortly after the philosopher's death.

abundant proof, alike furnished by intermarriages of human races and by the interbreeding of animals, that when the varieties mingled diverge beyond a certain slight degree, the result is inevitably a bad one in the long run." Waiving for the present any consideration of the soundness or unsoundness of this advice which has but little bearing on our own problem, this letter only goes to show that as late as 1892 the admission of the foreigner to Japanese intermarriage was still *sub judice* among Japanese statesmen and patriots.

A social phenomenon of such magnitude, a phenomenon which has prevailed for centuries among representative nations of the most important division of civilized humanity, comes dangerously near being an all but universal law of human society, at least of human society at a certain stage of development. And it behooves us, before studying its specific manifestations in any one of the nations still affected by it, to inquire into the nature of its cause or causes. We will naturally not be satisfied with a cause less general than the effect. A local, narrow and specific cause will necessarily be only of local application, and to assume that a number of different and independent local causes have just happened to produce an identical phenomenon over such a wide extent of both space and time would be utterly repugnant to the scientific spirit. What is it then that underlies this seclusiveness of peoples? What is this powerful control, along definite lines, of one of the most powerful of human instincts? The answer frequently given is Race. We will not stop now to ask for a precise definition of race, which, as we shall see, is far from easy to give. We shall assume that for practical purposes the term conveys a sufficiently distinct meaning, and broadly speaking, such a thing as race instinct is certainly a fact which is especially evoked at the meeting of widely diverging races, such as the white and the black, and fairly explains the phenomenon now under consideration, as far as such races are concerned. But what about the phenomena we have adduced just now? Are they all explained by the race theory? Does the Persian Shiite, who will

freely affiliate with the Turkish Shiite, but who will not so much as eat with an English or German Christian, obey a race instinct? The probabilities are that he does not know the Aryan theory, according to which the Aryan Englishman is his racial kinsman, while the Mongolian Turk is a total stranger. But if he did, I am sure he would not care. You see at a glance that the Brahman and the Kshatria, presumably of the same so-called Aryan race, are yet epigamically taboo to each other as to the lowest of outcasts. You know that when the Attic law prohibited the marriage of an *ἰσότης*, a citizen, and a *ξενή*, a foreign woman, and refused to consider their offspring legitimate,⁶ it interposed a barrier between Greek and Greek.

We thus see that identity of race is not incompatible with an embargo on intermarriage. The complementary truth that diversity of race has been no barrier to intermarriage is testified to with even greater emphasis by all history past and present. It looks very much as if the race theory will have to be given up. But this is only what is happening to it all along the line. Propounded in 1854 by Gobineau in that ponderous essay in four volumes, on *The Inequality of the Human Races*, this theory has had during the last half century the good luck to enlist among its converts a number of clever historians, who saw in it the potentiality of some brilliant generalizations and of flattering national conceit under the sober guise of science. I need not tell you how it played into the hand of vulgar Teutomania, Celtophobia and Antisemitism; you know how incense was daily burned for the nostrils of that monstrous fiction, the Aryan race; how some drew between Aryans and non-Aryans a line which according to Elie Reclus, would have been scarcely sharper if it had been drawn between men and brutes.⁷ Well, all this is now *ein überwundener Standpunkt* among Anthropologists. Elie Reclus condemns it. E. B. Tylor declares that "in most or all nations of mankind crossing or intermarriage of races has taken place between the conquering invader

⁶ Wachsmuth, *Hellenische Alterthumskunde*, vol. I, p. 205.

⁷ *Encyclop. Brit.*, vol. VIII, p. 621, col. 2.

and the conquered native.”⁸ And, finally, no less a man than Virchow, in his essay, *Rassenmischung und Erblichkeit*,⁹ pronounces the conception of race as vague and indefinite because “we know of no people which has not been mixed with other peoples, so that to our knowledge no pure race exists. So far as race is concerned there is no valid criterion,” he tells us, “in color, form of skull, language, or any other test known at present.” This result obtained by Virchow in his essay is also confirmed by our own H. Steinthal in the essay which follows it.

Prejudice has a tendency to tarry somewhat longer in historiography than in a purely physical science like anthropology; but when historians generally will begin to realize what a plausible fake this race theory has been, what a cheap device it is to say, e. g., a certain people has failed along certain lines because it was racially unfit to succeed, and thus to dispense with the labor of searching into historic causes; when they will perceive that such an explanation is on all fours with the classic explanation that opium puts to sleep because it has soporific virtues; when this will happen, I say, this theory will vanish from our histories as it has already from our scientific textbooks.

Abandoning, therefore, a theory, which is not only unable to cope with the facts, but which is found to have no scientific *locus standi*, we naturally resort to the only other phenomenon, which, by the universality of its sway, and by the potency of its appeal, is alone equal to the task before us. That phenomenon is Religion, that is, the relation in which man has conceived himself to stand to the gods. In classic antiquity, Coulanges tells us, the citizen was recognized by the fact that he had a part in the religion of the city, and it was from this participation that he derived all his civil and political rights. . . . “If we wished to give the exact definition of a citizen, we should say that it was a man who had the religion of the city. Being a citizen was called in Greek *συντελεῖν*, that is to

⁸ Encycl. Brit., vol. II, p. 117, col. 2.

⁹ In Festschrift für Adolf Bastian.

say, making the sacrifice together. The stranger, on the contrary, is one who has not access to this worship, one whom the gods of the city do not protect, and who has not even the right to invoke them. . . . Thus religion established between the citizen and the stranger a profound and ineffaceable distinction. It forbade the right of citizenship to be given to a stranger. . . . Demosthenes gives the true reason for this, 'It is because the purity of the sacrifices must be preserved.' To exclude the stranger was to "watch over the sacred ceremonies." To admit the stranger among the citizens was to give him a part in the religion and in the sacrifices." Now, for such an act the people did not consider themselves entirely free, and were seized with religious scruple. The gift of the citizenship to a stranger was a real violation of the fundamental principles of the national religion; and it is for this reason that, in the beginning, the city was so sparing of it. But should you perhaps think that stranger means barbarian, your error could not be greater. It just meant a citizen of another Greek city, for it was a religious impossibility to be at the same time a member of two cities, as it was also to be a member of two families. One could not have two religions at the same time. The participation of worship carried with it the possession of rights. . . . The stranger, having no part in the religion, had none in the law. If he entered the sacred enclosure which the priest had traced for the assembly, he was punished with death. The laws of the city did not exist for him. If he committed a crime he was treated as a slave and punished without process of law, the city owing him no legal protection.¹⁰ Speaking of the Aryan as a whole, W. E. Hearn writes: "In archaic society the unfailing centripetal force was community of worship. As many as were forms of worship, so many were the associations of men."¹¹ Those who worshipped the same gods were relatives, although no drop of common blood flowed in

¹⁰ *Ancient City*, pp. 258-262.

¹¹ *The Aryan Household*, p. 5.

their veins.¹² The members of a community always *assumed* the fact of their consanguinity."¹³

It remains for us to ascertain whether these truths, so abundantly attested for the Aryans, are also true of the Jews. Does the scientific verdict that there is no pure race include us too, or do we constitute the exception that proves the rule? Not that I know what good it would do us if we did. A perfectly pure race would at best be an ethnological curiosity, and nothing more. Unmixedness as such guarantees no physical, intellectual or spiritual excellence. The prehistoric tribes were probably much less mixed than the modern European nations, yet they possessed no special superiority on that account. However, as we are in conscience bound not to arrive at conclusions *a priori*, nor to accept or reject theories as they happen to flatter us or the reverse, let us ask ourselves soberly: What do the recorded facts of Jewish History say to our question? Do they give us the answer we have already found for one grand division of the human family and thus permit us the satisfaction of feeling that we have been brought face to face with a real sociological law; or do they give a different answer, thus compelling us to account for the aversion to intermarriage among Jews by some new cause, different from the one we have found operating amongst other white folks? Well, history's verdict in the case of the Jew is strikingly in accord with what we have found it to be in the case of the Aryan. And the more closely the data are studied, the more accordant do the answers prove to be. We find that, as respects intermarriage, Jewish history divides itself into two periods, the one stretching from the earliest beginning to the publication of the Deuteronomic code in 621 B. C., or perhaps, to be more rigorously exact, to the time of Ezra; the other from then till the nineteenth century. These two periods may be roughly characterized by the familiar rabbinic dichotomy of קורם מן תורה and לאחר מן תורה, terms representing a real historic fact, if we render them

¹² Ibid., p. 27.

¹³ Ibid., p. 113.

somewhat paraphrastically, as respectively *before and after the maturing of a clear religious consciousness*, and date the turning point about a thousand years later than the Rabbis do. We shall find the first of these periods characterized by as great a laxity with regard to intermarriage with the alien, as the second is by an uncompromising severity in opposition to it. But what else would this prove, should we succeed in establishing it, but that in proportion as the religious consciousness is vague, inchoate, half-formed, there is little objection to intermarriage with the stranger, and what little there is, is of that feeble, unresisting, sentimental variety that gives way before the first gust of real passion and the determined claims of natural impulse? Samson's parents indeed feebly expostulate with their wild boy, maintaining that there is a plenty of comely maidens in Israel, yet when the latter firmly declares that he will have the daughter of the Timnite Philistine and no other, his parents secure her for him, attend the wedding feast, and behave pretty much as if nothing out of the way has really happened. Similarly we read that Esau married two daughters of Heth, and that they were a grief of mind to Isaac and Rebecca,¹⁴ much as parents now-a-days may deplore the misalliance of a wilful son. The marriage, nevertheless, takes place and is regarded as perfectly valid, albeit the parents would have preferred to have their son married into another family. What a difference with the stand taken by an Ezra or a Nehemia! But I am anticipating. My task is to establish that during the period I have called **קורם מתן תורה** intermarriage between Jew and alien went on on a scale sufficiently large to silence forever the claim of racial purity for the Jew. I am quite aware that an individual case of a Samson or an Esau, or a Judah, marrying the daughter of a Canaanite,¹⁵ or a Joseph, a David, a Solomon, an Ahab, or a score of such worthies scattered through some centuries, or even that of Moses, the son of Amram, marrying a Cushite

¹⁵ Gen. 38:2.

woman, though it is said that he was equiponderous with all Israel, are not at all conclusive. Ethnological phenomena are after all not chemical phenomena, where a difference of one-tenth of one percent of the weight of a hydrogen molecule was a sufficiently large disturbance to lead to the discovery of a new element. I understand very well that a race might show a score or even several score mixed marriages in a few centuries, and not forfeit the claim to purity. Our case, however, is by no means dependent on the individual intermarriages recorded. A little word like פלגש (the Greek *πάλαξ* Latin *pellex*,) is worth more than thousands of isolated cases of intermarriage on record. A word is imported with the object it denotes, and as the word is quite familiar in the Bible, so must the object have been quite familiar in the ancient Israelitish family, I mean the concubine of Hellenic origin. The great multitude (אֲסֻפָּה) which, according to Exodus, accompanied the Israelites from Egypt and finally coalesced with them, a miscellaneous horde of all sorts of extraction, is an element not to be ignored in the racial character of the following generation of Israelites. The Deuteronomic law sanctioning while regulating the marriage with the comely heathen captive,¹⁶ only bears testimony to a practice in Israel similar to one known the world over, and which could not but materially affect the purity of Jewish blood. Then comes the author of the book of Judges and tells us with great frankness, even though, one feels, it must have been painful for him to record it, "And the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanite, the Hittite and the Amorite, and the Perizzite and the Hivvite, and the Jebusite, and they took their daughters to be their wives and gave their own daughters to their sons, and served their gods."¹⁷ This depicts a condition of things that was going on for centuries. No wonder that the rugged Ezekiel, who is not in the habit of mincing words, reminds Jerusalem in that terribly scathing

¹⁶ Dt. 21:10ff.

¹⁷ Jud. 3:5-6.

Chapter XVI, that her father was Amorite and her mother Hittite.¹⁸ But why go so far down the stream, when at the very fountain-head, as it were, of Jewish national life, we meet with this infusion of foreign blood. Four out of the twelve sons of Jacob have for mothers the handmaids, that is the foreign female slaves, Bilha and Zilpa. Whether we take this story literally, as our fathers did, or conceive it as retranslating into the biography of eponymous tribal ancestors what must have been known as a contemporary fact, viz., that the population of the tribes Dan, Naphtali, Gad and Asher was the offspring of Jewish fathers and non-Jewish mothers, the inference is unavoidable that, according to records that we can not possibly call in question, fully one-third of the population of Israel was of mixed descent! Add this to the testimony from Craniometry, according to which some sixty percent of ancient Jewish skulls have the Hittite conformation and some twenty-seven that of the Amorites, now maintained to be Aryans. Cautious as one would be in accepting the verdict of Craniometry unsupported, how eloquent does it become when it merely corroborates the unimpeachable testimony of Genesis and Ezekiel! Enough. He who would, after all this, talk of Jewish racial purity, must be a sceptic indeed.

Let us halt for a moment and fix in our consciousness what has been established thus far. During a period of one thousand years, at least, if we count from the Exodus, and some fifteen hundred years, if we mount up to Abraham, the Jewish people did not hesitate to assimilate foreign races. From Abraham, who circumcised "all the men of his house, and those bought with money from the stranger,"¹⁹ and whose example was no doubt followed by millions of his descendants down to the very end of the period we are concerned with, a constant adoption into the covenant with Jahveh and a constant incorporation into the community of Israel went steadily on, and for a very considerable period, if we are to trust the Book of

¹⁸ Verses 3 and 45.

¹⁹ Gen. 17:27.

Judges, the covenant with Jahveh was altogether dispensed with. For the question that concerns us now, I mean the consideration of race purity, this is a detail which has no bearing on the subject. With or without the Abrahamitic covenant a stranger is a stranger. On the biological plane, that thing they call race is a fatality, a species of *ἀνάγκη*, which, as it can not be changed, can neither be approved nor disapproved, rejected or adopted. A man is and remains, must remain, what he was born. There can be no apostasy from, or conversion to, a race. But, fortunately, man is more than an animal. His soul is more plastic. Human history, human institutions, and especially that preeminently human thing, Religion, are psychological phenomena. On this plane, fatality gives place to freedom, not absolute freedom, perhaps, but freedom nevertheless. It is on this plane that the battles of humanity have been fought, tragedies enacted and victories achieved. Whatever grain of truth there may be in the materialistic interpretation of history, the material element must first be translated higher up, must be sublimated, as it were, into the psychic realm, before it can begin to count among the factors in the evolution of humanity, as such.

Thus, for a millenium and a half of history, and who knows for how many more during prehistoric times, the Jewish national body was being formed out of the most heterogeneous materials. Canaanite, Hittite and Edomite; Syrian and Arab; Egyptian, Greek, and his kinsman, the Amorite, each contributed his greater or lesser quota to the making of the body of the Jewish people. Israel contributed the soul. Numerically not at all so preponderant, if Ethnology is to be trusted, Israel must have been psychically sufficiently strong and dominant, as to mould all these multifarious ethnic elements into one distinct, national individuality. Else we should have had no nation but a conglomerate horde, or the Bible, if such a thing had come to be written, would have recorded the history of Hittites, perhaps, instead of that of Israel.

I hope I do not seem to you to gloat over this fact of the

mixed blood of the Jew. On this point I am happy to be of the same mind as our eminent co-religionist, Salomon Reinach, of the French Academy.²⁰ I should not hesitate to accept the racial purity of the Jew, if it were a truth, no matter what bad use pseudo-sociologists made of it. But I reject it without a qualm of regret or a tremor of rejoicing, simply because it is a fiction, and in the long run it is best to sail under true colors. The most that I might ask, if I were allowed to be so absurd, as to wish to reform history backwards, would be to diminish the Hittite and increase somewhat the Amoritic ingredient of the compound, though, after all, who can tell whether the "blond beast" of antiquity was half as interesting as his modern kin?

Along with the growing, strengthening and maturing of the body of the Jewish people, there went on, at a somewhat slower pace, the upbuilding of the Jewish soul. What with the noble traditions of the patriarchs, the colossal personality of Moses, the divine genius of the prophets, the simple piety of priest and Levite; after centuries of travail, lashed hither and thither by current and counter-current, going through experiences grave and gay, sublime and sordid; treasuring memories of lowly life in Egypt, of the bliss of God's liberty and tutelage in the desert, of Babylon's splendid civilization, of the sweet and idyllic life in Padan Aram, the Jewish soul grew steadily, and gradually began to realize herself as a distinct individuality.

It is from this signal event in our national soul-life that I propose to date the second great period of our historic existence, which I have designated by the familiar name of **אחר מתנותיה**. Its grand culminating point is the return from the Babylonian captivity. Chastened by the first really great national catastrophe, but also sobered and deepened by it; humbled indeed by the ruin of their state, yet exalted by an inevitable comparison of their own crushed and bleeding self with the monstrous, gloating, soulless idolatry around them; there by the rivers of

²⁰ Cultes, Mythes et Religions, vol. III, p. 460.

Babylon where they sat and wept at the thought of Zion; as they sat brooding over the fickleness of fortune, the vanity of earthly grandeur; there as they realized their utter loneliness in the wide world, with God alone as a possible friend; there they swore the mighty oath: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand forget its cunning; may my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I shall not remember thee." There was born the sad but exalting consciousness of their uniqueness and their determination to live in accordance with it. Whatsoever happens from now on bears the stamp of that experience, which burnt itself into the deepest recesses of the soul. No longer shall we find them chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of political grandeur; no more frivolous toying with foreign fads and fancies. Lost forever is the taste for idolatry, which for the first time they had a chance to see on a grand scale in its native hideousness. Israel will henceforth live for God and for God's law. Israel will live, and, if necessary, die for this ideal. Those who would join him are indeed welcome, but no longer on the free and easy terms of the first period. They must identify themselves entirely with his life and ideals, or stay away. The **גר** must henceforth be a **גר צדק**. Strikingly different as this attitude to the stranger now becomes from what it was during the former period, it nevertheless obeys one law of life. A healthy organism demands that the foreign element introduced into it should be capable of assimilation, a demand which it was easy enough to satisfy during the formative period of Israel's soul-life, but which becomes quite difficult now that Israel has grown to his full spiritual stature; and progressively more so as time proceeds. The admission to intermarriage begins to be beset with serious hindrances. The Deuteronomic law, which had not much chance of application between its promulgation and the closely following Babylonian captivity, is now for the first time seriously enforced, with even a greater degree of severity than is warranted by its letter. Israel, it seems, is determined to live his own pure, intense, religious life, even at the risk of being un-

gracious to his neighbors. International amenities and neighborly courtesies are all very well; but if these have to be bought at the price of his individuality; if they have to be cultivated at the risk of disloyalty to the law of his God, he will sternly set his face against them. The word *גֵּר* and its equivalent *προσήλυτος* assume now for the first time the meaning of *convert*. These converts are at present neither exactly sought nor rejected, but when they come they must be whole-souled, or else they would mar by their coldness and indifference the intensity of the new life, and prove a jarring note in the divine harmony of life in the Law. And O! how Israel loved that Law! What a joy it was to him to study it, to ponder over it, to live it! You often hear the uninitiated speak un-understandingly of the burden of the law. Burden, indeed! Read the passionate rhapsody of Psalm 119 and then tell me, if you can, that he who sang it, and the thousands who joined him, felt the law to be a burden:

O how I love Thy Law!
It is my meditation all the day;
Thy commandments make me wiser than mine enemies,
For they are ever with me.
I have more understanding than all my teachers,
For Thy testimonies are my meditation.
I understand more than the aged,
Because I have kept Thy precepts.
I have refrained my feet from every evil way
That I might observe Thy word.
I have not turned aside from Thy judgments
For Thou hast taught me.
How sweet are Thy words to my taste!
Yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth!
Through Thy precepts I get understanding,
Therefore I hate every false way;

or take this:

Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness;
Thy law is truth.
Trouble and anguish have taken hold on me,
Yet Thy commandments are my delight;

or this:

Unless Thy law had been my delight
I should have perished in my affliction.
I will never forget Thy precepts,
For with them Thou hast quickened me.
I am Thine, save me,
For I have sought Thy precepts;

and so on, and so on, for one hundred and seventy-six stanzas. Does this sound as if the law was a burden? This paean of joy, this ecstasy of bliss! Can you imagine a dull, patient, legalistic burden-bearer to sing that way? . . . One in the throes of such a mighty passion, such a fine frenzy, knows nothing of moderation, scorns the sensible calculation of cost, ignores every worldly consideration of convenience. Thus Israel went on with a soul afire, cherishing the sacred passion for his ideal, creating a richer and ever richer religious life, replete with pious practices, saintly habits, hallowed ceremonies—sacred symbolism all of heavenly love. To the outsider all this could not mean anything, even as the rich symbolism of earthly love is a foreign tongue to all but the two young hearts concerned. Thus was Israel left alone to live his life and to dream his dreams, during those generations of silence, of which history has hardly anything to record; but that an intense inner spiritual activity was going on all the time and creating a nation of saints and loyalists was signally proven by the splendid uprising under the Maccabees of a people capable not only to live its religion, but to die for it, when necessary. It was after the great crisis of the Maccabean wars, when so much saintly blood was spilt in defense of our right to be ourselves, when

passions had not yet cooled and resentment still ran high, that those stern decrees of the Asmonean Beth-din were enacted, intended as an additional barrier between Israel and fascinating though treacherous Hellenism (כִּי אַתָּא רַב דְּמִי אָמַר בֵּית דִּינֵנו שֶׁל חֲשֵׁמוֹנַי נָהָרוּ הֵבֵא עַל הַנִּזְיוֹן חַיִּיב עָלֶיהָ מִשּׁוֹם נָדָה שְׂפָחָה נְיִוָּה אִשְׁתֵּי אִישׁ. כִּי אַתָּא רַבִּין אָמַר מִשּׁוֹם נָדָה שְׂפָחָה נְיִוָּה זֹנָה).

Some two centuries later, exasperated by the unbearable tyranny, cruelty and extortion of the Romans, the stormy Synod held at the house of Hananiah, the son of Hezekiah,²¹ interdicted all friendly intercourse with גוֹיִם, which, of course, meant Romans.²²

Our contact with Greeks and Romans, it appears, was not such as to predispose us to particularly love them. The Greek civilization we only learned to know in its mongrel, Hellenistic variety; and of Rome only the mailed fist and the irresponsible tyranny of provincial procurators. It is under such sad, strained and bitter relations that those fateful sentences in the Mishnah and the Baraitha were hammered out, denying the heathen, not only *de jure*, intermarriage with Israel, but refusing such a marriage validity *de facto*, or in the phraseology of the Roman law, constituting the religion of the non-Jew not only an *impedimentum impediens*, but *impedimentum dirimens*, so that when such an illicit union did take place, it was regarded as absolutely null and void, the non-Jewish party being considered, like the slave, of a status incapable of connubium with the Jew. It is, however, only fair to remind you what has already been shown in the early part of our discourse, that this is precisely the attitude the ancient Greeks and Romans took to strangers. And the motive here, as well as there, was religion—not race, as I believe, has been amply shown.

²¹ Or, according to Graetz, III, note 26 (where he amends the Mishnah in Sabbath, 13b), his son Eleasar. The exact time of this Synod is assigned to about four years before the destruction of Jerusalem. See, however, Isaac Hirsch Weiss' trenchant criticism in Dor Dor We-dorshaw, vol. I, p. 187.

²² Aboda Zara, 36b.

To dispel, however, the last traces of possible lingering doubt as to this motive, as far as Israel was concerned—for I know how hard it is to dislodge an error which took a deep hold by dint of constant repetition—let me draw your attention to the phenomena of proselytism. That the phenomenon was wide-spread throughout the Graeco-Roman world, you well know to be attested by Josephus, the Acts of the Apostles, the Sibylline Books, the Satires of Horace and Juvenal, the inscriptions on Roman tombs and the Talmud. The illustrious cases of the conversion to Judaism of the royal family of Adiabene, or the inclination, if not conversion to Judaism, of the Empress Poppaea are well known. But there was hardly a Jewish community anywhere in the Diaspora, to which there was not attached a considerable body of proselytes. The entire female population of Damascus, Josephus tells us, were converts to Judaism. The *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν* of the Acts and of Josephus are already found as early as the time of the composition of the Hallel as "יְרֵא" (Ps. 115:11), who, after the house of Israel and the house of Aaron can be no other than the complete proselytes (see Rashi ad locum), as evidenced by the fact that they constitute an integral part of the Temple worship. Now, all this would have been absolutely impossible, if the Jewish aloofness from the stranger were based on racial and not on religious grounds.²³

²³ The isolated opinion of the comparatively unknown Rabbi Helbo

קשים נרים לישראל כססחה (Niddah, 13b) is, to begin with, offset by a number of contrary opinions, and especially by that of Rabbi

Eliezer: לא הנלה הקב"ה את ישראל לבין האומות אלא כדי שיתוספו עליהם נרים שנא' וזרעתי לי בארץ כלום אדם זורע סאה אלא כדי להכניס כמה כורין

(Pesahim, 87b) Besides, the exact import of R. Helbo's opinion has, at least in the age of the Tosaphists, not been regarded as quite settled. See Tosaphoth to Kiddushin, 70b, s. v. קשים for three different interpretations, all favorable to proselytes. Cf.

also Yebamoth 79a אין לך אומה שראוי להדבק בה כזו ... מיר ניתוספו

על ישראל מאה וחמשים אלף נרים It can not be denied that held an inferior position in the aristocratically organized

The birth and rise of Christianity seem to have left the Jewish people comparatively indifferent, so much so that no notice was taken of it by our chief contemporary historian, and little beyond a few scattered insignificant notices are to be found in the Talmud. The movement evidently failed of its appeal in the home of its birth. Whether it was the extravagant claims of its founder, or the attempts to bring back methods of an age of miracles, which the Jewish people had outgrown for centuries or the total lack of sympathy on the part of its followers with Jewish traditions and aspirations, this is not the place to discuss. Meantime the great life and death struggle with Rome arrives, and while all that was noble and brave in Judaea spills its blood in defense of altar and home, the Jewish-Christian communities, those "pious sectarians"—in the phrase of Renan—"know only how to escape." Technically there was no more cause to exclude them from Jewish intermarriage than the Sadducees, who are nowhere excluded. But they do not remain long enough on the stage of history. They soon merge into the great body of Heathen Christians and vanish.

This great bulk of Christendom, with the Gospels, those insidious anti-Jewish pamphlets, for a sacred book, could not but be regarded by us as Gentiles, and to the extent to which they were civilized, as **נָרִים תּוֹשָׁבִים**, entitled indeed to our just and humane treatment, but not to intermarriage.²⁴ When only a century or so later the Jewish people could not but observe

Jewish community (Kiddushin 41). They were, however, admitted to intermarriage with all social grades below the highest, i. e., the priests. Most native families were not better situated (cf. Sanhedrin 42).

וּמִי כָל שֶׁאִסְרוּ מִשּׁוּם חֲתָנוּת אֶף הוּא [נָרִים תּוֹשָׁבִים] אִסּוּר בּו שֶׁהָרִי הוּא בְּכָלל²⁴
 אִסּוּר מִחֲתָנוּת וּלְפִיכָךְ יִינוּ אִסּוּר בִּשְׁתִּיה כְּשִׁמְנו (בְּכָף מִשְׁנֵה בֶשֶׂם הַרִשְׁבִּי"א. הַל'
 מֵאֲכָלוֹת אִסּוּרוֹת י"א, ז.)

לֹא רָצָה [אִשֶּׁת יוֹפֵת תֹּאֵר] לְהִתְנַיֵּיר מִנִּגְלִין עִמָּה שְׁנַיִם עֶשֶׂר חֳדָשׁ לֹא רָצָה
 מִקְבֵּלֶת שֶׁבַע מִצּוֹת שֶׁנִּצְטָווּ בְּנֵי נֹחַ וּמִשְׁלַח לַנֶּפֶשׁ וְהָרִי הוּא כְּכֹל הַנָּרִים הַתּוֹשָׁבִים
 וְאִינוּ נֹשְׂאֵה שֶׁאִסּוּר לִישָׂא אִשָּׁה שְׁלֹא נִתְנִיירָה (רַמְבַּ"ם הַל' מַלְכִּים פֶּרֶק ח' הַל' ז')

For a curious overlooking of the above, cf. Fassel, *Mosaisch-Rabbinisches Civilrecht*, sec. 65.

that these travelers with a baggageless Judaism (as a brilliant contemporary conceived Christianity) had already succeeded in picking up enough baggage on the way to satisfy the most fastidious, and to split up into numerous sects, piously cutting each other's throats in squabbles over this very baggage; how one sect of the followers of the gentle Nazarene, in the interests of salvation, administered the holy eucharist to their brethren of another sect by previously forcing open their mouths with pincers, they could not, I imagine, but register a mental reflection or two at the expense of the Paulinian antithesis of Love versus Law, and wonder if the brand new baggage of Trinity, mariolatry, hagiolatry, auricular confession, worship of relics, etc., etc., was after all much of an improvement on the old. Such reflections, not unmingled with a degree of sadness for the race as a whole, must have made them feel that their refusal to throw themselves into the arms of all-embracing love did not, after all, argue such hard-heartedness and spiritual blindness as is sometimes made to appear.

This condition of things did not improve; if anything, was rather intensified with the centuries. Then, to the baggage already mentioned there was added another article, the celibacy of the Clergy. As to its effect on European society, I can do no better than to invite your attention to the opinion of the founder of the science of Eugenics, Francis Galton: "The long period of the Dark Ages," he says, "under which Europe has lain, is due in a very considerable degree to the celibacy enjoined by the religious orders on their votaries. Whenever a man or woman was possessed of a gentle nature that fitted him or her to deeds of charity, to meditation, to literature or to art, the social condition of the time was such that they had no refuge elsewhere than in the bosom of the Church. But the Church chose to preach and exact celibacy. The consequence was that these gentle natures had no continuance, and thus by a policy so singularly unwise and suicidal that I am hardly able to speak of it without impatience, the Church brutalized the breed of our forefathers. She acted precisely as if she aimed at

selecting the rudest portion of the community to be, alone, the parents of future generations. She practiced the art which breeders would use who aimed at creating ferocious, currish and stupid natures. No wonder that club law prevailed for centuries over Europe; the wonder rather is that enough good remained in the veins of Europeans to enable their race to rise to its present very moderate level of natural morality."²⁵

You see that we had few incentives in those days to revise our laws about intermarriage with non-Jews. But it would have done us no good if we had. The Church was busy erecting fences on its own side, and I have collected in an appendix to this paper all the decrees of the Church councils between the fifth and the thirteenth centuries prohibiting friendly intercourse and intermarriage between Christians and Jews. It is sometimes argued by advocates of intermarriage, that during these centuries, intermarriage between Jews and Christians must have taken place in sufficient number to serve as a motive for these canons of the Church-councils, and that consequently, in Europe at least, the prohibition to intermarry with non-Jews must have been understood not to apply to Christians, who are certainly no idolaters. There is enough truth in this error to make it dangerously plausible, and it calls therefore for a thorough refutation. Let us admit at once that a score of passages, and more, might be quoted from the Talmud and rabbinic sources, to show that the rabbinic law does not place Christians in the same category with heathens, yet it would be false to conclude that intermarriage with Christians is not forbidden. The underlying trouble is the fallacy known to logicians as *ignoratio elenchi*. The term intermarriage, as it concerns us today, and the same term, as used in Talmudic literature, are not identical in meaning. When we discuss intermarriage, we are concerned to know whether or no two individuals of different faiths may enter a matrimonial alliance, while *remaining respectively in their different faiths*. To the Talmudic doctors of all ages such a question would have been too preposterous to

²⁵ Hereditary Genius, p. 357.

ever occur. Civil marriage, we must remember, is decidedly a nineteenth century idea. When the rabbis treat of intermarriage of other nations with Israel, granting it to some and denying it to others, it is always *after conversion*. Thus the seven Palestinian nations are debarred from Jewish intermarrying, forever, even after conversion. (From the Rabbinic point of view it would be meaningless to prohibit this before conversion, since then they are by status incapable of matrimony.) The same is true of the Ammonites and Moabites. Other nations are more favored and are granted this privilege two generations after conversion. Still others in antiquity, and all nations today *אחר שבה סנהריב ובלב לכל האומות* have this privilege immediately upon conversion. And this is the position, be it clearly understood, which Christians occupy, as regards intermarriage with Jews, according to the Talmud. Those intermarriages between Jews and Christians which no doubt occurred and gave rise to the conciliar prohibitions, must have taken place in violation of the Talmudic law, or else the Christian party been clandestinely converted to Judaism.

We feel the more free and frank to state this Talmudic position, as to us the Talmud has only historic, but no religious or legal, validity. And we think it high time for all those, who hold a similar position with regard to the Talmud, to quit toying with an ancient, respectable and self-consistent code, for the purpose of foisting on it positions it never did nor could hold. There was indeed a time in the early days of Reform, when a procedure like this used to be considered very learned and distinguished. The numerous vagaries, anachronisms and insincerities that this occasioned are well known to the initiated. Today there is not a shadow of an excuse for indulging in this kind of prestidigitation. Whether we do or do not believe in intermarriage, the Talmud should not be judicially tortured to lend the weight of its authority one way or another.

Our chapter on the practice of intermarriage, *in the modern*

sense of the word, between Jews and non-Jews, during what we termed the *לאחר מכן חורה* period, may well shrink to the dimensions of the famous chapter on the snakes in Iceland; and the theory is fully stated in exactly three words, "אין קידוש" תופס", consistently applied on religious, and only religious, grounds. Rabbinic law would not be swayed by any other considerations, and least of all by those of blood. Nay, on the contrary, the suspicion of a tinge of Jewish blood in a non-Jewish community would put such a community on a footing incomparably more unfavorable as to intermarriage with Jews than if it were of pure unadulterated heathen extraction. For while the latter would be admitted to intermarriage immediately on conversion to Judaism, the former is forever debarred from Jewish proselytism because the Jewish element in it, having lived outside the law, must have become affected with the taint of *ממזרות* which is past all remedy, as under the circumstances it would be impossible to sift the *ממזרים* out of the remainder of the population.²⁶ It is in perfect consistency with the Talmudic view that Rabbi Moses di Trani (a contemporary of Joseph Karo), in his *Responsa שערי צדק* Vol. I, Nos. 19 and 38, decides emphatically to refuse readmission to some members of a certain Jewish sect who ask for this privilege, and anathematizes those who would intermarry with Karaites. He makes it quite clear that there would be no trouble about receiving outright heathens as proselytes and admitting them eventually to Jewish intermarriage.²⁷

So simple is the solution of a problem when its elements are simple. Talmudic Judaism has a number of clearly defined categories and never a doubt as to where a person belongs. The Jew under this regime knew what it meant to be a Jew; he

²⁶ Cf. Yebamoth, 16a.

²⁷ יט. והללו שבירשתם פקרו בעקר תורה ונשאו עריות והולידו ממזרים וחללו שבתות. ואילו לא היו עיקרן מישראל היינו חושבין אותם גוים כשאר שמניירין ומובלין ונעשים כשאר ישראל.... אבל הללו בין שעיקרן מישראל ועדין שם ישראל

knew that as Jew he was different from the whole world. He felt this difference; was proud of it, thanked God for it every day of his life. Under such conditions strict endogamy is the most natural thing in the world. The law can not possibly be felt as a burden, as something coercive and external. It is the most adequate expression of an inner necessity, clearly and deeply realized. Just try to conceive an orthodox Jew of the old type, those of you who have known him, whose life is veritably steeped in religious observances, live in harmonious wedlock with a Catholic or even a Protestant woman, and you will see that the very idea is preposterous.

With the advent of the nineteenth century all this changed. New factors begin to complicate our problem. The emancipation of the Jew from his ancient civil disabilities, and not so much that as his straining to achieve it; the introduction of civil marriage into many European States, which curiously happened to be just those where the Jews were granted civil liberty; and that indefinable something which, for want of a better name, we call the modern spirit, and which acted as a solvent of many old ideas and long established institutions—all this could not but modify the practical as well as the theoretical conditions of our problem. Our modern Jew quietly omits that daily gratitude for not being a Gentile. Has he ceased to be proud of being a Jew? O, no! Perish the thought! But somehow he has ceased to feel grateful for not being a Gentile. Ah,

עליהם ומצות נוהגות בהם מחויבין בתרי"ג מצות וכיון שהיו פריצים בעריות ולא כתבו נטי נשים בניהם ממורים ואי אפשר לקבלם ולהכניסם בקהל שמא יתערבו בישראל וישאו נשים וישאו בנותיהם לבני ישראל ומרבים ממורים בישראל לפיכך אי אפשר לקבלם כל עיקר

לח... ואלו הקראים... אנו מחרימין... לרדוף ולגדות ולהחרים על אותם המשיאין להם בנותיהם שעוברים על לאו לא יבא ממור בקהל ה' ועל לפני עור לא תת ממשול, כי נשיתיהם מקדשות להם מן התורה... והבא עליהם בחנק.... וכשמגרשים נשותיהם שלא כדת ומשנים ממטבע שטבעו חכמים בנטי ונשאות לאחרים בחיי הבעלים נמצאו הבנים ממורים מאשת איש בלא יבא, על כן לא יחיל טובו כל המדבק בהם וכל חכם המורה עליו אני קורא וזן מרא

it is that leaven of the modern spirit! He is still different from the Gentile; he knows it. But somehow he no longer exults in it, feels even daily more annoyed at it. In a word, he is fully in the throes of the great passion for assimilation. His casuists facetiously tell him לעולם יהא אדם "To the world be a man," ירא שמים בסתר "your religion keep to yourself!" And poor Israel, that high-strung visionary, who never did a thing in cold blood, went into this thing called assimilation with the same intensity and fine frenzy, with which at one time he steered the diametrically opposite course. How like himself in this mad attempt of becoming unlike himself! But this playing with fire was a dangerous game. A religion one is no longer proud of; a religion one must keep in strict privacy, gets soon to be felt as an unwelcome burden and is discarded. The apostasy *en masse*, of the early days of the nineteenth century, was the price Israel had to pay for the fatal Mendelssohnian error of combining *Aufklärung* with Orthodoxy. Many, of course, did not go quite to that length, but remaining technically within the fold, are daily swelling the great tide of Jewish indifferents, our so-called Race-Jews. Inter-marriage with Christians, in these ranks, is almost a foregone conclusion. For what is there to prevent it? The temporary shyness and strangeness, which centuries of alienation could not fail to produce, usually disappear after a generation or two, and then the road is wide open to the complete merging of the minority into the majority. But this contingent, much as we may regret the fact, is really not properly within our consideration. Our problem lies nearer home. Will Reform Judaism, without receding an inch from its advanced position as a liberal, progressive religion, evolve enough positive elements of an intense Jewish religious consciousness, to feel itself distinct from all the other forms of religious liberalism, constantly given off by Christianity? If so, then the apparent *rapprochement* of the liberal wings of the synagogue and the church can possess no serious significance and furnish cause for neither exultation nor regret. For, the

moment mere liberal negativism gives place to affirmation, then all that is distinct, and unique, and elemental, on either side, must come to the surface, and, with all the mutual good-will in the world, the two camps will remain apart. "I am still I and thou art thou." If, on the other hand, fate should decree that this should not happen, or should we regard it as a consummation by no means devoutly to be wished (which attitude of ours will be no inconsiderable factor in that decree of fate), then it is hard to see how, outside of pure mathematics, you will make an asymptote constantly approach a curve without them eventually coinciding, or, in plain English, how you will keep two contiguous social groups apart, that speak, think, act, feel and finally pray, alike.

Thus it is seen that the question of intermarriage today resolves itself into the question of our conception as to the tendency of Reform Judaism; and this brings me to the theoretical aspect of the question of intermarriage in the nineteenth century. The declaration of the Napoleonic Sanhedrin on our subject need not detain us longer than to say, that it is a plain subterfuge; pardonable, perhaps, under the circumstances, but a subterfuge nevertheless. They say in their French text that "civil marriages between Jews and Christians are civilly obligatory and valid, though not susceptible of being invested with religious forms. While in the Hebrew paraphrase which accompanied the answers,²⁸ they say **אף על פי שהוא מן הנמנע** ... **שיהיו קרושין תופסין** I will not offend you by trying to *prove* to you that the Hebrew clause, which is an unqualified denial of *connubium* between the parties, is the very negation of the statement in the French text that the marriage is obligatory and valid. There is no refuge even in the qualifying adverb "*civilement*," for the Talmud knows of no other than civil validity. Well, it will probably do little good at this late day to condemn those good people, who no doubt meant well.

²⁸ Quoted by Einhorn in the Jewish Times, 1876, No. 48, p. 10.

Indeed, if France was well worth a mass to Henry IV, Jewish emancipation may equally have been well worth a subterfuge.

But this subtle shift has more than a moral side to it; it has a historic significance of no small import. It is the first time that a representative body of orthodox Jewish authorities put themselves on record that they dare not indorse a Talmudic position in the face of the great world. Though they still believe it, since they whisper it, as it were, among their cronies, in unmistakable Hebrew, they dare not bluntly say, that a Jewish man living with a Christian woman lives out of wedlock and that the children from that union are not his. . . . This significant phenomenon is henceforth the abiding trait in all subsequent pronouncements on the question of intermarriage—I mean the entire abandonment of the radical attitude of the Talmud. The most strenuous opponents of intermarriage do not think for a moment of denying validity to a nuptial union between Jew and Christian. The most they do is to ask to be excused from officiating at a function which they disapprove of. What a significant change of front from a question as to the recognition of *connubium* and the legitimacy of children, to that whether a clergyman ought or ought not to be present and pronounce a ceremonial benediction! Exactly as if a great controversial battle had been fought and the radicals won the day. And yet you know that nothing of the kind happened. The battle had been won before the first shot had been fired; and the laurels are all due to the logic of History.

The discussions which take place on this subject throughout the century are all on this milder plane, I will frankly admit that they do not make interesting reading. The radical *Braunschweig* Conference ratifies in undignified haste the answer given by the orthodox French Sanhedrin, without so much as taking the trouble to have before them the original document. The other conferences, conservative all, are all so mild, and hesitating, and apologetic, in their disapproval of intermarriage, that you are involuntarily reminded of Samson's parents protesting against their son's wish to marry the daughter of the Philistine

and then going to the wedding. Your modern rabbi has too much of sweetness and light to make a very sturdy opponent. "The native hue of resolution is sicklied o'er by the pale cast of thought."

Thus Ludwig Philippson disapproves of intermarriage and yet feels himself forced to grant that "it is certainly our duty to widen the sway of tolerance, so that it may rule over all classes of individuals, however they may differ in regard to creed and religious life. . . . Therefore, little as any true friend of religion and humanity could wish that religion should stand between those who sincerely love and cling to each other; deeply as it must pain him to grieve such persons, still from the standpoint of religion, he can not but disapprove of mixed marriage."²⁹ Somehow you catch yourself wondering whether the enlightened Rabbi does not protest too much.

Geiger disapproves of intermarriage. But he begins by saying that "the marriage between a Jew and Christian, when concluded in a legal manner (by civil authorities only), is by no means without moral worth, and religion, even from its standpoint, can not deny the validity of such marriage."³⁰

Dr. Aub disapproves of intermarriage. But he starts by telling us "that according to some Biblical and even some rabbinical utterances, the marriage between Jews and Christians might be declared as sanctioned. Such intermarriages already occurred as early as the Middle Ages, until interdicted by the Church."³¹ I can imagine an impatient couple, candidates for such a disapproved marriage, say to these rabbis: "We thank you, gentlemen, for your kind and encouraging words we heard so far. We are too impatient to stay and hear more, but we are sure that whatever else you may find to say, can not really matter much after what you have already said—and that is quite enough. As long as we shall after marriage remain within

²⁹ Israelitische Religionslehre, Leipzig, 1865, Vol. III, p. 250.

³⁰ Referate über die der ersten Israel. Synode überreichten Anträge, pp. 187, 188.

³¹ Ibid p. 193.

the Law, within morality, and even within the sanction of Bible and Talmud, what more can we want?"

In this country the tone on both sides is considerably sturdier. The clarion notes of David Einhorn about intermarriage being the coffin nail of the small Jewish race are well known. I had hoped to be able to give you some specimens of the controversy between him and Samuel Hirsch, an opponent worthy of his steel, from which you might have seen the warm earnestness, the fine erudition, the brilliant fencing of both combatants. But this paper is already too long and the time is limited. I must therefore proceed to sum up.

We have seen

(1) That opposition to intermarriage is a universal phenomenon of civilized humanity.

(2) That its underlying motive is not distinction of race.

(3) That races readily do, and always did, intermarry, until no pure race is any longer in existence.

(4) That the only motive sufficiently powerful to keep contiguous human groups from intermarrying is a strong sense of religious distinctiveness.

(5) That intermarriage and a sense of religious distinctiveness, other things being equal, will vary inversely, and thus each may serve as a barometer to measure the strength of the other.

Our problem then merges into the wider problem as to what ideal we shall cherish for the future of Judaism. If we are fascinated by the universalistic ideal of Samuel Hirsch, and hail with delight the *rapprochement* now taking place between a wing of the Church and a wing of the synagogue, as an earnest of a yet greater movement which will eventually embrace all mankind, then we must indorse his attitude on intermarriage. For there is no halting amid stream. Our premises make our conclusion inevitable. If, however, for one reason or another, we shrink from the conclusion, then we must accustom ourselves to face deliberately and of set purpose the ultimate ideal of Jewish religious distinctiveness and individuality, an ideal which need not at all smack of reaction or obscurantism, as

some people think. We must, with David Einhorn, emphasize the all-importance of a Jewish mission, but we will have to bear in mind that to strain every fibre to become like somebody else, and at the same time talk about our mission to *convert* that somebody else, i. e., to make him like ourselves, who are all the time aching to be like him, is to say the very least—amusing. We are liable to wake up some fine day and find that sensible people are laughing at us.

Yes, the ideal of a Jewish individualism, or a Jewish mission, if you please, honestly, fully and consistently embraced is alone able to check intermarriage. This, I think, is the verdict of History. But whether we really care enough to check intermarriage to be ready to pay for it by such a rigorous policy, or whether the opposing ideal is not worthier, more practicable and more in accord with a tendency we have contributed no little to create, is a fascinating problem, indeed, but is no longer within the scope of this paper.

Appendix I.

Ecclesiastical Canons prohibiting friendly intercourse and intermarriage between Christians and Jews.

CONCILIVM CALCHEDONENSE.

ACTIO DECIMA QUINTA.

(Leo P. I., Valentinus et Macianus Imperatores, 451 Anno Christi.)

CANON 14....μῆτε μὴν συνάπτειν πρὸς γάμον αἵρετικῶ, ἢ Ἰουδαίῳ ἢ Ἑλληνι· εἰ μὴ ἄρα επαγγέλλοιτο μετατίθεσθαι εἰς τὴν ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν τὸ συναπτόμενον πρόσωπον τῷ ὀρθοδόξῳ· εἰ δὲ τις τοῦτον ὅρον παραβυίῃ τῆς ἀγίας συνόδου, κανονικῶς ὑποκείσθω.

CONCILIIUM VENETICUM.

(Hilarus P., Severus Imperator, circa 465 Anno Christi.)

CANON 12.... Omnes deinceps clerici Judaeorum convivia evitent, nec eos ad conviviam quisquam excipiat: quia cum apud Christianos cibis communibus non utantur, indignum est atque sacrilegum eorum cibos a Christianis sumi: cum ea quae Apostolo permittente nos sumimus ab illis judicentur immunda, ac sic inferiores incipiant esse clerici quam Judaei, si nos quae ab illis apponuntur utamur, illi a nobis oblata contemnant.

CANON APOSTOLICUM.

(Circa 500 Anno Christi.)

CANON 63.... Εἰ τις κληρικὸς, ἢ λαϊκὸς εἰσέλθῃ εἰς συναγωγὴν Ἰουδαίων, ἢ αἰρετικῶν προσεύξασθαι, καθαιρείσθω καὶ ἀφορίζέσθω.

CONCILIIUM AURELIANENSE II.

(Joannes P. II., Justinianus Imperator, Childebertus Rex Francorum, 533 Anno Christi.)

CANON 19.... Placuit ut nullus Christianus Judaeam, neque Judaeus Christianam in matrimonio ducat uxorem, quia inter huiusmodi personas illicitas nuptias esse censemus. Qui si commoniti a consortio hoc se separare distulerint, a communionis gratia sunt sine dubio submovendi.

CONCILIIUM AVERNENSE.

(Agapetus P. I., Justinianus Imperator, Childebertus Rex Francorum, 535 Anno Christi.)

CANON 6..... Si quis Judaicae pravitati jugali societate jungitur, et seu Christiana Judaeo, seu Judaeus

Christianae mulieri carnali consortio misceatur, quicumque horum tantum nefas admississe degnoscitur, a Christianorum coetu atque convivio, et a communione ecclesiae, cuius sociatur hostibus, segregetur.

CONCILIIUM AURELIANENSE III.

(Silverius P., Justinianus Imperator, Childebertus Rex Francorum,
538 Anno Christi.)

CANON 13....Christianis quoque omnibus interdiciamus, ne Judaeorum conjugiiis misceantur: quod si fecerint, usque ad sequestrationem, quisquis ille est, communione pellatur. Item Christianis convivia interdiciamus Judaeorum; in quibus si forte fuisse probantur, annuali excommunicationi pro hujusmodi contumacia subjacebunt.

CONCILIIUM TOLETANUM III.

(Pelagius P. II., Mauricius Imperator, Reccaredus Rex Hisp.,
589 Anno Christi.)

CANON 14....Suggerente Concilio, id gloriosissimus dominus noster Canonibus inserendum praecipit, ut Judaeis non liceat Christianas habere uxores vel concubinas, neque mancipia Christiana comparare in usus proprios: sed et si qui filii ex tali conjugio nati sunt, assumendos esse ad baptismum: nulla officia publica eos opus est agere, per quae eis occasio tribuatur poenam Christianis inferre. Si qui vero Christiani ab eis Judaico ritu sunt maculati, vel etiam circumcisi, non reddito precio ad libertatem et religionem redeant Christianam.

CONCILIUM TOLETANUM IV.

(Honorius P. I., Heraclius Imperator, Sisenandus Rex Hisp.,
633 Anno Christi.)

CANON 63....Judaei qui Christianas mulieres in conjugio habent, admoneantur ab episcopo civitatis ipsius, ut si cum eis permanere cupiunt, Christiani efficiantur. Quod si admoniti noluerint, separentur: quia non potest infidelis in ejus permanere conjugio quae jam in Christianam translata est fidem. Filii autem qui ex talibus nati existunt, fidem atque conditionem matris sequantur. Similiter et hi qui procreati sunt de infidelibus mulieribus et (in) fidelibus viris, Christianam sequantur religionem, non Judaicam superstitionem.

CONCILIUM CONSTANTINOPOLITANUM.

(Agatho P., Constantinus Pogonatus Imperator, 680 Anno Christi.)

CANON 11....Μηδεὶς τῶν ἐν ἱερατικῷ τάγματι ἢ λαϊκὸς τὰ παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἄζυμα ἐσθιέτω, ἢ τοιοῦτοις προσοικιονόσθω, καὶ ἰατρείας παρ' αὐτῶν λαμβανέτω, ἢ ἐν βαλανείῳ παντελῶς τοῖτοις συλλονέσθω. εἰ δέ τις τοῦτο πράξαι ἐπιχειροίη, εἰ μὴν κληρικὸς εἴη καθαιρέσθω· εἰ δέ λαϊκὸς ἀφοριζέσθω.

CONCILIUM ROMANUM I.

(Zacharias P., Constantinus Copronymus Imperator, 743 Anno Christi.)

CANON 10....Si quis Christianus filiam suam Judaeo in conjugio copulare praesumpserit, nisi perfecte crediderit Christo et baptizatus fuerit; vel servum aut ancillam Judaeo Christianus venundare praesumpserit, et si vidua Judaeum duxerit virum, vel consentientibus ei, anathema sit.

CONCILIIUM METENSE.

(Stephanus P. V., Arnulphus Rex Germaniae, Odo Rex Francorum,
888 Anno Christi.)

CANON 7.....Guntbertus Metensis ecclesiae primicerius obtulit libellum proclamationis super Judaeos qui habitant Metis. Quapropter interdictum est, juxta capitula sanctorum patrum, ut nemo Christianorum cum eis manducat et bibat, vel quidquid comedi aut potari potest a Judaeis accipiat. Nimis enim, juxta quod ait Caesarius Arelatensis ecclesiae episcopus, indignum est atque sacrilegum eorum cibos a Christianis sumi, cum ea, quibus nos fruimur, ab illis judicentur immunda, ac inferiores incipiant esse Christiani quam Judaei. Et omnes eorum convivias ipse, et sanctus Syagrius, Aedurorum episcopus, cum aliis multis, excommunicaverunt.

CONCILIIUM VIENNENSE.

(Clemens P. IV., Richardus Imperator, 1267 Anno Christi.)

CANON 17....Si quis vero Judaeus cum aliqua Christiana fornicationis vitium deprehensus fuerit commississe, quoadusque decem marcas argenti ad minus pro emendatione solverit, districto carceri mancipetur; et mulier Christiana, quae tam damnatam coitum elegerit, per civitatem fustigata, de ipsa civitate sine spe redeundi penitus expellatur.

CANON 18....Item omnibus Christianis istius provinciae et civitatis et dioecesis Pragensis sub poena excommunicationis districtius inhibemus, ne Judaeos vel Judaeas ad convivandum recipiant, vel cum eis bibere aut manducare audeant, aut etiam cum ipsis in suis nuptiis, vel neomeniis, vel ludis

saltare, vel tripudiare praesumant; nec Christiani carnes venales, seu alia cibaria a Judaeis emant, ne forte Judaei per hoc Christianos, quos hostes reputant, fraudulenta machinatione venenent.

CANON 19....Christiani, si opus fuerit, per censuram ecclesiasticum compellantur ab eorum [Judaeorum] commerciis abstinere. . . . Ne praesumant de fide Catholica cum simplicibus disputare, (nec filios et uxores Judaeorum ad fidem Christianam venientium invitos audeant detinere). Nec Christianos ad Judaismum alliciant (aut aliqui ausu temerario circumcidant): nec Christianos infirmos visitent, vel circa ipsos exerceant opera medicinae. Ipsos quoque principes ac judices eorundem districtius admonemus, ne Judaeis statuta nostra servare nolentibus alicuius protectionis seu defensionis favorem impendant: sed si aliqua eis a praelatis ecclesiasticis injungantur, ea fideliter exequantur, alioquin introitum ecclesiae et communionem divinorum officiorum sibi noverint interdictum.

Appendix II

Statistical Data as far as to me accessible.

Husband and wife

	Jewish	Mixed
Prussia,	1900.....4,799	474
Berlin,	1899..... 621	229
Bavaria,	1899..... 416	31
Budapest,	1898.....1,238	146
Vienna,	1898..... 847	110
Prague,	1898..... 354	6
New South Wales, 1901.....	786	686 were that year living in wedlock.

To 100 pure Jewish marriages, there are mixed:

		Husband Christian	Wife Christian	Total
Copenhagen,	1880-1903.....	65.38
Germany,	1901-1904.....	8.01	9.26	17.27
Prussia,	1875-1879.....	5.37	4.46	9.83
"	1880-1884.....	5.11	5.25	16.36
"	1885-1889.....	5.89	6.46	12.35
"	1890-1894.....	6.22	6.34	12.56
"	1895-1899.....	7.91	9.04	16.75
Berlin,	1875-1879.....	16.43	19.64	36.07
"	1895-1899.....	13.07	21.05	34.12
"	1904.....	15.10	24.00	39.10
Bavaria,	1876-1880.....	2.18	1.68	3.86
"	1881-1885.....	1.46	1.79	3.25
"	1886-1890.....	1.84	2.63	4.47
"	1891-1895.....	3.41	3.41	6.82
"	1896-1900.....	2.97	5.87	8.84
"	1903.....	4.18	3.05	7.23
Hesse,	1866-1870.....	0.50	0.50
"	1871-1880.....	1.82	0.89	2.71
"	1881-1890.....	2.82	1.59	4.41
"	1891-1900.....	3.06	1.90	4.96
"	1901-1904.....	3.16	4.17	7.33
Amsterdam,	1899-1901.....	?	?	9.45
"	1902-1904.....	15.08
Hungary,	1895-1903.....	2.98	2.97	5.95
Budapest,	1896-1900.....	7.22	6.11	13.33
"	1901-1902.....	7.86	6.98	14.84
"	1903-1904.....	8.22	8.84	17.06
In Germany,	1901-1904, No. of pure Jewish marriages...			15,635
"	" " " " mixed " ...			2,700
In Prussia,	1876-1904, No. of pure Jewish marriages...			71,160
"	" " " " mixed " ...			2,700

In Prussia average annual	No. of mixed marriages,	1875-79..	239
" " " " " "	" " " "	1895-99..	433
" " " " " "	" " " "	1900-04..	495
In Berlin " " " "	" " " "	1875-79..	101
" " " " " "	" " " "	1895-99..	201
" " " " " "	" " " "	1898-02..	212
" " " " " "	" " " "	1904 ..	246

Rate of increase of intermarriages at Copenhagen between 1880 and 1903:

	Mixed Marriages
1880-1890.....	55.17%
1891-1900.....	71.03%
1901-1903.....	89.74%

In Denmark there were between 1873 and 1891 308 marriages, of which 187 were pure and 121 mixed. Hence, percentage of mixed = 64.74.

Similar conditions prevail in Sweden.

D

MIXED MARRIAGES IN THEIR RELATION TO THE
JEWISH RELIGION.

REV. DR. S. SCHULMAN, NEW YORK CITY.

No question is so important for the Reform Synagogue as that of mixed marriage. The fundamental principle of Reform Judaism seems to the writer of this paper to be the conception of Israel as a priest-people scattered all over the world, becoming an integral part of the nations in whose midst it dwells, looking not backward to a restoration to a political nationality, with a re-established Temple and sacrificial cult, but looking forward to the future, when the world having become full of the knowledge of God, as the waters cover the sea, Israel will have fulfilled its divine mission and will have performed the work of uniting the whole human race in the worship of the one true God. This fundamental conception of reform Judaism implies the approach of Jew and non-Jew, the whole-souled co-operation of citizens of a country of various religious and the adjustment of the ceremonial and ritual expression of the religion to the environment, in such a way as to do away with all unnecessary walls of separation between Jews and their non-Jewish fellow-citizens. It is therefore a most urgent question as to what attitude the Reform Synagogue shall assume with respect to the practical question of mixed marriages.

By a mixed marriage, I understand a marriage between a Jew or Jewess, a son or daughter of Israel and a person not professing the Jewish religion, or belonging to the House of Israel. I like to distinguish the phrase *mixed marriage* from *intermarriage*. By intermarriage, we understand exactly what Dr. Kohler in his article on Intermarriage in the Jewish Encyclopedia, defines it to be, a marriage between persons of different races or tribes. The Synagogue, according to the law and practice which have been in vogue for twenty centuries, has

not been opposed to such inter-tribal or inter-racial marriage. It has been uniformly opposed to marriage of a Jew or Jewess with persons who profess another religion and have not been converted to the Jewish religion. The point of view, therefore, from which I shall attempt to discuss this question, is exclusively that of religion. Can the Jewish religion, even as interpreted by Reform Judaism, sanction a mixed marriage where the non-Jewish party remains unconverted to the Jewish religion? And before entering upon the question, I would wish to dispose of one aspect of it, which is usually brought into discussions by moderns, but which does not belong to it at all. That a marriage between a Jew and a non-Jewish person is legally valid from the point of view of the law of the State in which the Jew dwells, is a matter of course. For, aside from the fact that there is a view in the Talmud which might be taken as considering such a marriage as *fait accompli* (Sanhedrin, 51a), to be valid though not permitted, the principle always adhered to by our teachers that the law of the State is binding, will satisfactorily answer the question of the legal validity. Furthermore, we must not lose sight of the distinction laid down and become a permanent element of the philosophy of Reform Judaism by Holdheim, that since the destruction of the Jewish State, that element in Judaism which had to do with purely political and civil matters has ceased to be an integral part of it. Judaism is a religion, and not a system of statutes of an independent state. Of course, during the middle ages, when the Jews were separated from their fellowmen by artificial walls of exclusion, the autonomy forced upon them, perpetuated the existence of their own civil law and prevented the clear disengagement of the religious and ethical from the purely political and civil in Judaism, which could only take place in a time when Jews became completely dowered in civilized lands, with political and civil rights and were recognized as members of the body politic. It is quite true that in the Mosaic State, considered as a theocracy, every law was regarded as of religious significance. But with the fall of

that State, the purely jurisprudential element in Judaism, that which has reference to the relations as to rights and duties between men in their purely civil nature, as members of a State, was logically dissociated from the purely religious and moral teaching of Judaism and from those symbols, ceremonies and institutions, which are expressive of the religious and moral teachings. Therefore, for us, Judaism being a religion only, the law of the country is binding. Indeed, religion and morality dictate to us that we, in a law-abiding spirit, respect the government and the law under whose protection we live. Therefore, when the "French Sanhedrin," in 1807, in reply to the third question of Napoleon, said that the Grand Sanhedrin declares "that marriages between Israelites and Christians, contracted in conformity with the laws of the civil code, are obligatory and valid, civilly, and that although they are incapable of being clothed with religious forms, they do not entail any anathema (or excommunication);" they, strictly speaking, gave very little information. They were absolutely in accord with the spirit of the principle *Dinah D'malchuthah Dinah*, "The Law of the Land is Law." When they said that such marriages can not be clothed in the forms of religion, they also asserted that from the point of view of Judaism, such marriages are to be condemned. Their addition that they would not entail excommunication, meant very little, inasmuch as the weapon of excommunication had ceased to have any force. But to a Jewish mind, the mere fact that they could not be clothed in religious forms, was sufficient to condemn them. And furthermore, when we consider the Hebrew phrase, which is given as a translation of the French, *En Kiddushin Tofsin*, that with respect to such marriages, Jewish marriage, *Kiddushin*, is not applicable, then anyone who knows the real significance of that phrase, as a technical term in Jewish jurisprudence, will immediately recognize that the Sanhedrin felt that such mixed marriage, from the point of view of Judaism, was forbidden. The question that we are to discuss is not, do we recognize a marriage between Jew and non-Jewess in accordance with the

laws of our country as valid? Of course, we do. As to the issue, however, of such a marriage, when it comes to a Rabbi for the purposes of marriage with a Jew or Jewess, the Rabbi will have to be governed in his decision by the requirements of the Jewish religion. Judaism obeys the law of the State, recognizes the duty of the Israelite to obey that law. But Judaism reserves for its own conscience the right to speak on the desirableness or permissibleness of certain matters, from its own point of view, and to teach and morally enforce upon its adherents its own decisions. The Rabbi is not allowed by his religion to do anything against the laws of the State, but he can be prevented by his religion from doing something which the State gives him the choice to do or not to do. No Rabbi is compelled to solemnize a mixed marriage. It is exactly for such marriages that the civil magistrate will be the best person to functionate. He represents the State and no church. And people who belong to different religious communions and who still wish to intermarry, should not ask a representative of their religion to officiate, the ceremony of whose officiating must necessarily be imperfect. But they should seek the moral validity and legality of their marriage at the hands of him who represents the State that stands over and protects the integrity of all religions. In this paper, therefore, we have nothing to do with the question of the legal validity of such marriages. We have only to do with their relation to the Jewish religion, and ask whether they ought to be prohibited by Judaism.

And again in answering this question, I must say that the Hagadic literature, both with respect to its beautiful ideals of marriage and to its interpretation, in an exclusively religious spirit, of the prohibition against mixed marriages, will help us more than the Halacha. It is most remarkable to observe how many a reform theologian of the nineteenth century, despite the fact that in other respects, he is radical and originally creative in emancipation from the Halacha, in the case of mixed marriage, where it suits him, tries to prove its permissibility, from the standpoint of the Halacha itself. In my opinion, the

true method is to ask our own religious sense, to interpret our own religious consciousness, to examine whether from the point of view of the highest ideal of marriage, and from the point of view of the integrity of Judaism as a religion, and the duty of the Rabbi as the representative of such a religion, mixed marriages can be permitted. Then, even if the Talmudic Halacha gave any shadow of support for the contention for the permissibility—which it does not—that would be no reason for us to follow it, if we were convinced that for *our* religious insight, such marriage is inadvisable and injurious to Judaism. We certainly, as Reform Jews, have been acting against the Halacha in many respects, because we felt that the Halacha, in many instances, reflected circumstances and conditions of life which were outgrown, and was informed by the spirit of an age, dominated by ideas to which we can not subscribe. Why must we be slaves of the Halacha? But the fact is, neither the Halacha nor the Hagada, nor the present religious consciousness, permits mixed marriages from the standpoint of Judaism. I intend, in as brief a manner as possible, to discuss this question from the point of view of the ideal of marriage, of the integrity of Judaism, of the function of the Rabbi and of the conversion of the non-Jewish party to the Jewish religion. For I can not emphasize it too strongly, nor make it too clear, that the synagogue has no objection to people of any race or inherited creed, because of their past. What the synagogue asks of them before it can sanction their marriage to the son or daughter of Israel, is the acceptance of the Jewish religion. Its whole objection, then, is purely a religious one. There exists at present an impediment to marriage between Jew and non-Jew. When that impediment is removed by conversion, such marriage can take place. It is absolutely necessary to avoid misunderstandings, to make this attitude clear. Judaism assumes more or less the same attitude as Catholicism and Protestantism with respect to this question.

It can not be my province to go into an historical study of this question, as that has already been provided for in the

learned paper read. I need not load my paper with many authorities. I will simply tell you that I have read up on the question Leopold Löw, Holdheim, Fassel, the controversy between Hirsch and Einhorn, Mielziner, and have looked up for myself the Talmudic and post-Talmudic sources, to which these writers refer. In the main, one meets with repetition in all of them, without certain important features of the question being brought out with sufficient clearness and force. The historic part, for all purposes, is very clearly and succinctly put, in my humble opinion, by Mielziner, in his *Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce*, in his modest and unassuming way, which was characteristic of this very learned man. One gets there the exact statement of facts. Strictly speaking, there never was any serious division of opinion from Ezra to our time, as to the prohibition against marriage between an Israelite and a non-Israelite, who has not accepted Israel's religion. Even a man like Samuel Hirsch declares himself in favor of asking a Christian woman, who wishes to enter marriage with an Israelite, to be converted to our religion, because he is influenced by the Talmudic principle, based on excellent psychology, and therefore with religious justification, which states of a mixed marriage, that the status of the child is determined by that of the mother. It is, therefore, not very profitable to load a paper of this kind with a repetition of authorities and discussions, which each one can find for himself in the places indicated. The tradition is uniform. The Talmud, the Poskim and the Rabbis, to our time, whatever exception an individual may here and there have made, were convinced of the undesirability of such marriage and of its prohibition. It was an astonishment to me to discover that Holdheim had quoted the Samaglavim incorrectly, when he said that Moses Mikuzzi asserted that it is allowed to intermarry with all other nations outside of the seven mentioned in Exodus xxxiv, 16, and Deuteronomy vii, 3-6, inclusive. As a matter of fact, the Samaglavim says in the Venice edition that "all other nations after they are converted" and that is the accepted law.

Now, then, without any display of quotations of learning, let us approach this question from our own religious point of view. I would therefore say, in the first place, that the ideal of marriage as laid down in the Scripture, would naturally prohibit such mixed marriages as are here discussed. According to the spirit of Scripture, and also to its letter, in its opening chapters, there can not be any *racial* impediment to marriage between Jew and Gentile. For the one God of heaven and earth created one humanity. His unity is mirrored in the unity of the race made in His image. This is the ideal. It will become fact when in the words of the Prophet, His unity will be acknowledged by the whole world, and therefore His name will be One. Scripture presents all races as descended from one pair. It therefore excludes any pretensions to aristocracy of blood. It is not our business here to discuss the natural-historical significance of such a statement. It is our business to understand its religious significance, and with respect to this, there can be no question. Our sages understood it when they said, that the most important sentence in the Bible is "This is the Book of the generations of man." Therefore, there is in principle, no objection to inter-racial marriage. What objection exists, according to the teaching of Scripture and Talmud and post-Talmudic literature, inheres in the facts of life which do not square with the ideal. Humanity breaks up into a multiplicity of races and creeds, and therefore all opposition to intermarriage with other races, as given in Scripture, is deliberately based upon the reasons clearly expressed in Exodus and Deuteronomy, lest such marriage turn away the son or daughter of Israel from the true religion. And we hold that Rabbi Simeon, who in the Talmud (Kiddushin, 68b) interprets the phrase in Deuteronomy, "lest he turn away," to include all non-Jews that may turn away Jews from a perfect loyalty to their Judaism, and thus undermine the faith, was a sound exegete, nay, he was a good Reform Jew. For, if I understand the philosophy of Reform Judaism at all, it has to do with the spirit of the Thorah, more even than with the letter,

and it does have much to say about general principles as contrasted with special embodiment of those principles in concrete rules. And it is certainly a great surprise to me that the reformers who favor mixed marriage, rather clutch at the letter of the Halacha and lose sight of the spirit. Rabbi Simeon was correct. The Torah naturally speaks according to contemporaneous conditions, but if we want to be guided by it, we must listen to the spirit that is in it. All prohibitions, therefore, in the Torah, are in the nature of provisions meeting conditions which have temporarily broken the unity of humanity. The religious ground is always the dominant one for exclusion of mixed marriage. The Hagada shows it in various ways, in a striking way, when it makes Isaac dissatisfied with the marriages of Esau because he was *מקביר על טנוף ע"י* (Ber. Rabbah, 65, 3), "sensitive to the defilement of the idolatry" which Esau brought into the house. The Hagada also shows the tendency to make all gentiles who are represented in Scripture as having married Israelites, as having been converted. It thus makes Ruth the typical proselyte. You may say that it projects its own views backwards, but it certainly is true to the spirit of the Torah in doing so. It identifies the Kushite woman whom Moses married, and of whom we recently heard so much, with Zipporah. Perhaps it knows about the identity as much as we do. However, we can leave to Moses the question as to whether his help-meet was in spirit with him. Certainly of Zipporah it is said, in the well-known passage, that she saw to it that the condition of the covenant was fulfilled with respect to her son. In a word, the tendency of the Hagada is to put the prohibition entirely upon religious grounds. That is by no means an accident. The Hagada is not alone thus the spokesman of the deep moral and religious impulses of the synagogue as an ecclesiastical organization. And in this connection it is well worth noting that Ezra complains of mixed marriage and uses the phrase "holy seed," not even the phrase "seed of Abraham, my friend," as the second Isaiah said, not "seed of Israel," but "*holy seed*," thus importing into physical

Israel a religious and theological term. And it is for this reason also that in giving the passage from Deuteronomy, I included the sixth verse, "for thou art a holy people unto the Lord thy God." It is purely and simply the religious character of Israel that makes it opposed to mixed marriages. The Hagada not only is thus expressive of this tendency, mirroring the complete conversion of Israel from a political nation into a holy people, into a *Keneseth Yisrael*, a Congregation of Israel. But the Hagada, also, as you know, has the most beautiful sayings, which I can not stop here to quote, but which you can all get from any encyclopedia, upon the ideal of Jewish marriage. If one wants to know what marriage amongst the Jews meant, he will not so much consult the Halacha, but he will preeminently go to the Hagada. Therefore, I conclude that the Hagada was guided by a profoundly true instinct in this matter, which in its attitude towards mixed marriage and in its attitude towards marriage in general, made it practically say that the ideal marriage which it contemplates must have as one of its conditions, harmony and unanimity in religion. Now what is the Jewish view of ideal marriage, as it is given in Scripture? This is laid down in the sentence of Scripture (Gen. ii, 24), "Therefore let a man leave his father and mother, and let him cling to his wife and let them become one." To my mind, there never has been spoken a more beautiful sentence with respect to marriage. A perfect and ideal marriage means a complete unity—not merely a physical union, and not merely a moral union, but it means a spiritual union, that there ought to be nothing of importance, and certainly nothing which touches the deepest and holiest questions of life, which can separate mind and heart of man and woman. Therefore, such a phrase gives all the conditions of an ideal marriage: Monogamy—marriage between one man and one woman, and such marriage is to be based upon a union of hearts in love, whose union is completed in the perfect marriage of souls. Such an ideal is necessary for the harmony and the happiness of those who contract the marriage and for the consecrated

rearing of children, which are the chief blessing that God may bestow upon such a union. And, therefore, the Rabbis in the Halacha had a correct feeling when they said that the marriage which Judaism contemplates, can only hold of people who are capacitated for entering such a complete, whole-souled union. And if anyone sought for an argument with which to contradict Holdheim, who is the main spokesman for mixed marriages in the last century, all he would have to do would be to hold up to him his own most beautiful and eloquent passage on what marriage should be, given on page 41 of his *Mamar Ha'ishoth*, in which he says, "And the highest union is a union of soul with soul, of spirit with spirit, that they become one body and one will in their love to one another, and that there be peace between them, that God's presence dwell in their midst and in their house, and that they be a support and a help to one another, God aiding them in the perfecting of themselves in morality and fear of sin, and that they have sons and daughters and rear them to the 'Thorah, to the chuppa and to good deeds,' in order that the people of God increase with its inheritance and its covenant and that it be like a green tree, ever producing fruit." This is, indeed, the ideal of marriage as conceived by Israel. And it is a remarkable thing that Holdheim, who is constantly blaming the Halacha for not having carried into law, the superior morality and spirituality with respect to the view of marriage which was prevalent with the Rabbis and found an expression for itself in the beautiful benedictions, *"שבע ברכות"* and which existed in the customs of the people, it is a remarkable thing that Holdheim should vitiate his own exaltedly moral and religious view of marriage, by making a new Halacha, and permitting in practice a mixed marriage which could never realize the ideal. For there could not be that complete union of souls and there could not be that perfect harmony and unity of household between two people who hold with serious conviction different views of religion. Holdheim, the practical reformer, was on the question of mixed marriage in contradiction with Holdheim the interpreter of

the spirit and ideal of marriage as taught by Judaism. We take high ground, therefore, and refuse to consecrate mixed marriages because they do not fulfill the conditions which the religious teacher in Judaism should recognize as indispensable for an ideal union. And as unions can take place legally under the aegis of the State law, where *religion* speaks at all, about marriage, it certainly should speak to men from the point of view of the ideal. Otherwise it has nothing to say.

We have dwelt at length on the relation of mixed marriage to the Jewish conception of the marriage relation. We found that, according to the ideals of marriage taught by Judaism, mixed marriage does not reach them. But a mixed marriage is also to be prohibited from the point of view of the integrity of Judaism as a religion, from the point of view of the interests of the synagogue; from the point of view of the safety of a religious minority, such as is Israel amongst the nations. Arthur Ruppin, in a little book, "Die Juden der Gegenwart," page 78, says, "Wie die Taufe so führt auch die Mischehe; d. h. die Ehe zwischen einem Jüdischen und einem anders gläubigen Ehegatten, eine Verminderung des Bestandes der jüdischen Bevölkerung herbei." We can only subscribe to such a statement. There can be no question that if the synagogue used its moral authority to allow such marriages, it would be doing what Einhorn said, "hammering a nail in the coffin of the Jewish race with its sublime mission." As you will see later, I emphasize the sublime mission more than the race. But for practical purposes, the thought is sound. And that is the view which has dominated all those who are opposed to mixed marriages, and it is certainly a view which ought to influence the conduct of a Rabbi when called upon to consecrate them. In the discussion of the point of view of Judaism and the interests of the Synagogue, it will be well to mingle with it the third point of view, the relation of the Rabbi as a representative of Judaism to such a mixed marriage. What is the function of the Rabbi? In all modern discussions there is wanting a definite conception of the Rabbi's office. He cer-

tainly has no mystic powers. In officiating at a marriage he imparts no sacrament. Even if people are married without him, he must from the Jewish point of view recognize such a marriage as valid and binding. He has no judicial powers, for as we said in the introduction, all juridical functions which may have pertained to the office of Rabbi in the past are done away with because of Reform Judaism's principle of the complete separation of church and state. For that matter, even from the standpoint of the Halacha, as Holdheim well points out, when a Rabbi acts as a *Mesadder Kiddushin* and officiates, he acts at best as an expert, but not as a judge. The Jewish law, as is well known, allows anyone to be a *Mesadder Kiddushin* to officiate at a marriage and regards the marriage as valid, when performed in accordance with the accepted formula and conditions in the presence of two witnesses. The Reform Rabbi must maintain the spirit of the old law, making no hierarchical pretensions. He must recognize all marriages performed in accordance with the laws of the State in which he lives, as valid, *Midearad* or fait accompli. But he ought to insist upon his character as an expert in giving religious marriage. He will certainly not perform such a marriage from the point of view of Judaism between Jews who are prohibited from marrying each other because of those degrees of consanguinity which Judaism forbids, even if a state law allows it. His conscience is his own and it is to be guided by the conscience of Israel, by the teachings of Judaism. And so in the matter of a mixed marriage that is suggested to him to be consecrated by him in the name of Judaism, he certainly ought not to consent. For how can he solemnize a marriage between a Jew and a Christian, be it in his capacity as teacher and adviser or as the representative of Israel? He certainly can not find in such a proposed union, the conditions, because of religious differences, which would make for the ideal unity which religion is to safeguard. But as you are all aware, an attempt has been made to distinguish between Christians who are monotheists and people of other religions with whom marriage was forbidden. It has

even been argued that in the moment when a Christian seeks marriage with a Jew, he is no longer a true Christian, because the true Christian dogma would necessitate looking upon an Israelite as everlastingly dammed. Therefore, the mere fact that the Christian party loves the Jew, shows that his Christianity is not a genuine one. But with all due respect to the great learning and philosophical insight of him who uses such an argument, let me say this is a misunderstanding. In the first place, it is best to leave to each religion its own interpretation of what it considers essential dogmas. In the second place, it is absurd to intimate that there are no real and vital differences between Christianity and Judaism as religions, sufficient to make mixed marriage between Christian and Jews fall under the category of such unions as would tend possibly to draw away the Jewish party from the religion of the fathers and thus disintegrate Judaism, and certainly above all, to make the religious education of the offspring very precarious, and thus, to use Holdheim's phrase, "prevent the tree of Judaism from growing fruit." For either there are such vital differences between Christianity and Judaism or there are not. If there are not, as some in their extreme latitudinarian liberalism and for the purposes of hasty speeches on liberal platforms seem to imply, then why the perpetuation of the centuries' tragedy of Israel's sufferings? I can not, in the form of a sub-section, go into a discussion of this theme (although it is very pertinent to this whole matter), and give an analysis of the differences between Judaism and Christianity. It is sufficient to say that Judaism emphasizes God and Christianity emphasizes Jesus. We mediate the religious consciousness through Israel. They, through one of Israel's sons. Would even the most liberal Christian today subscribe to the sentiment of Emerson, who said, "The dogmas of the mystic offices of Christ being dropped and he standing on his genius as a moral teacher, it is impossible to maintain the old emphasis of his personality, and it recedes, as all persons must, before the sublimity of the moral law." I certainly can not use other words to express the inner

radical difference between the attitude of Judaism and that of Christianity, than is expressed in this episode. Judaism says, we appreciate the influence of Christianity as a great moral and spiritual force in the national life of America, but even the most advanced sect in the Christian Church, like the Unitarians, with whom we have much in common, doctrinally, still differs from us in fundamental principles. Judaism emphasizes God and subordinates all personalities to Divine law. If, however, there be such a Christian who assumes the attitude given in the quotation from Emerson, we ask what shall prevent him from accepting Judaism as a religion? Certainly not his dogmas. It therefore must be the disinclination to call himself an Israelite. Then the question arises, why should the Rabbi consecrate such a union? Is it not silently to undermine Judaism when you consent to the creation of a home in which it is silently assumed that theism is sufficient. And furthermore, when, for instance, Löw says, vol. III, p. 170, that "the ground of prohibition is not dogmatic," in arguing against those who would exclude Christian monotheists from the prohibition, "but that it is national," he is mistaken. It is certainly dogmatic in my opinion and the dogma is the election of Israel. He who joins the household of Israel by accepting its yoke, becomes an Israelite. For the dogma consists in this, that Israel has been elected by God to be a priest-people in the world, therefore one may be born into the religion of Israel and one may become a member of the household of Israel and a member of the synagogue, by adoption. If, therefore, anyone refuses this, he indicates his dissent from the peculiar claim of Israel. There is, therefore, considering the dissenter's history and past, the great danger of *Ki yasir*, lest the Jewish party be turned away from loyalty to Judaism.

The arguments that are made for the mixed marriage to meet the objections here indicated are that we should not interfere with the natural manifestations of the divine sentiment of love. The synagogue should not stand between two loving hearts, lest it justly bring down upon itself the condemnation

of bigotry and inhumanity. We are certainly solicitous for the reputation of the synagogue. We are happy to say, and the members of the Conference will join me, that we have our share of liberality, and some of our greatest pleasures in our ministries come from the opportunities to co-operate with our fellow-men of other faiths, in moral, civic and social work. We certainly do not judge the worth of a human being by the creed he professes, rather by his deeds. And we have never forgotten the teachings of our sages, that the righteous of all peoples inherit the everlasting life and therefore we do not seek to convert them. And, on the other hand, we certainly appreciate the holy work which a pure love has to do in life. But there is such a thing as love being triumphed over by duty. It is a great, sometimes heartrending, conflict, to which the human soul may be exposed—the conflict between a great love and a loyalty to an ancestral faith, which for very good reasons prohibits the gratification of that love. But Jewish men and women have made greater sacrifices than sacrifices of love to duty. It is certainly not unworthy of our religion, for which so many lives have been laid down, and for which hundreds of thousands of men and women are suffering dire persecution today, to ask a loyal son and daughter of Israel to safeguard its interests and to rise to the heights of self-sacrifice. Furthermore, we are not at all interfering with the gratification of love. There is always the recourse to the civil magistrate. There is always the suggestion that the non-Jewish party may be converted to our religion, so that a marriage can be based on unity of faith. But if the non-Jewish party refuses, this is proof of his honest attachment to his own religion, and, therefore, this is the very reason for the Rabbi refusing to consecrate a marriage which will lead to what will be a spiritually divided home, because it would be violative of the ideal laid down for marriage in the sentence in Genesis with which I began. It is said also, that by refusing to sanction in the name of Judaism such a mixed marriage, we estrange the Jewish party from the synagogue. Isn't it better, it is some-

times argued, to hold, by some attachment to the synagogue the person whom you yourself claim to be in danger of drifting away from Judaism, because of his or her mixed marriage? I answer, no, it is not better. For, in the first place, many who have consecrated mixed marriages, have admitted that the results, with respect to rearing of offspring, as based upon promises, were disappointing, thus showing that the permission of an exception in violation of a principle did not even produce the utilitarian results expected. But I assert a religion condemns itself to destruction if it is always influenced in practical matters by concession and never stimulates the religious conscience and makes it vigorous by demanding sacrifice. I might expatiate on this theme, but a hint to the wise is sufficient. At all events, the Rabbi can not give marriage in the name of Judaism, with the formula, "in accordance with the law of Moses and Israel," or as I say, "in accordance with the faith of Israel and the law of God," and any other kind of marriage he must not attempt to give, for if he does he lends himself to an empty form, or what is worse, to a deception. He professes to clothe a marriage with Jewish religious forms, and he can not do so. For I take it, that a Rabbi is not merely a theist, but a representative of Israel's religion. You might say that he could do so purely in his civil capacity, but this would be utterly unworthy of the Rabbinical office. It is true, in our country, the State shows a courtesy to the representatives of the various religions by permitting them to perform a religious ceremony, and, at the same time, recognizes such a ceremony as binding, from a civil point of view, for it need not be said that marriage, one of the fundamental institutions of civilized society, has a politico-civic, as well as an ethico-religious aspect. Therefore, a minister of any religion in this country, when performing a ceremony, really acts in a two-fold capacity, as a representative of the State for that particular function and as a representative of his church. In accordance with the traditions of Judaism, civil marriage, as such, is by no means to be looked down upon. For, as Holdheim well

points out, the very essence of marriage in Judaism, as far as its bindingness is concerned, pertains to the fulfillment of the conditions of the civil contract. That is the Halacha. Even if the benedictions, which express the religious aspect of the marriage, were left out, the marriage, providing it conform to the legal conditions, would be binding. Therefore, a civil marriage is not in the eyes of Judaism as unholy a thing as it may be in the eyes of churches that hold a sacramental theory of marriage. A Rabbi will certainly not allow the thought to arise that a civil marriage, from a religious point of view, is sufficient. He certainly will not make it the standard governing exclusively his own Jewish view upon its desirability and its consequences. But a Rabbi acts, when he performs a marriage, as a civil magistrate and as a Jewish religious teacher. Speaking for myself, I always use the formula, when declaring man and woman as man and wife, "in accordance with the rites and usages of Judaism and in accordance with the laws of the State." But it is one thing to acknowledge a courtesy and incidentally to accept an obligation towards the State, and it is quite another thing to utilize such a courtesy in a way in which it was not intended. The Rabbi has no right to make his office that of a civil magistrate. He can only marry as a Rabbi, as a teacher of the Jewish religion. And he can only marry people who want their marriage invested with the forms of the Jewish religion. But this is not merely a question of maintaining the dignity of the office, there is a real ethical question involved in it. If according to Judaism, mixed marriage can not be sanctioned, then it is almost *g'nevath daath*, a deception to give the impression of a religious consecration, when there was no religious consecration in the name of Judaism. Again, it is said that the attitude of the synagogue refusing mixed marriage would prejudice our status socially. We would, of course, protest, if the civil law, as influenced by the spirit of the Middle Ages, would forbid the marriage between Jews and Christians. We would see in this a denial of a free man's rights, to which the Jew is entitled as well as any other citizen

of the State. We would want the State, with its civil marriage, to recognize no distinctions between creeds, because the State is absolutely separated from the Church. But, conversely, it does not hold good that the representative of Judaism should get all his inspiration and information, with respect to the ideals and interests of the synagogue, from the point of view of the State. If we refuse mixed marriage, and do so, as I have again and again, in the course of this paper, made clear, not on racial grounds, but on purely religious grounds, if the only impediment to a marriage between Jew and non-Jew is difference of religion, then no fair-minded person will be prejudiced against us, because every church has a right to safeguard its integrity and to prescribe the ideal for its members, especially so, if in the spirit of Judaism, it casts no aspersion on a civil marriage. On the other hand, those who are not fair-minded persons, will no doubt, warp and distort the attitude of the synagogue as they do many other matters pertaining to Jew and Judaism. But our religion has taught us that no weapon forged against us will succeed and every contending tongue will be condemned. We will, therefore, say that we can not conceive the possibility, from the point of view of what marriage ought to be and what the interests of the synagogue require, of a Rabbi, the representative of the synagogue, consecrating such a marriage.

What, then, remains to remove the impediment? We said that the only impediment was the difference of religion. If this impediment be removed, then Teuton, Celt, American, Englishman, Frenchman, Italian, anyone can marry the person of the Jewish faith. As the accepted law of the Shulchan Aruch has it, "all peoples, when converted, are regarded as Israelites for all purposes and for the purpose of marriage." It seems to me that Abraham Geiger, as quoted by Mielziner, gives the correct idea: "Religion, then," he says, "especially that religion which is not the prevailing one, and which because of being in the minority, is always at some disadvantage, can not be fairly blamed, if she hesitates to lend a helping hand

to further such marriages, if she prefers under such circumstances, rather to make the entrance into her folds less difficult to the outside party than otherwise, in the cases of proselyting, her duty would prompt her." Present conditions require the encouragement, not the discouragement of conversion. Two attitudes are possible for the Rabbi, that of minutely searching the past and that of hoping for the future. It is well known that the motive of marriage was regarded by the Halacha as a prohibitive factor in the mind of the candidate for conversion. But different conditions require different legislation. We would say, that if love draws the heart to our faith, it should not be considered a mercenary or meretricious motive. Certainly, the Rabbi will examine carefully the applicant, irrespective of the motive which dominates him, in order to assure himself whether the candidate for conversion is, considering past education, considering present mental status, sincerely ready to renounce all beliefs that conflict with the fundamental principles of Judaism, to accept sincerely and cordially, membership in the household of Israel, with its obligations and responsibilities, and above all, solemnly to promise, to give the proof of the sincerity of the conversion by the Jewish religious education of eventual offspring. The fitness of a candidate for conversion must necessarily be left to the Rabbi before whom the candidate appears. And a sacred trust it is indeed. But I do not think lightly of the promise of the human being who, with the utmost solemnity, declares himself ready to join the household of Israel. The ceremonial of conversion ought, indeed, to be made more impressive than it is now. The Rabbis of the Conference ought to devise some symbolic acts in the synagogue, for such conversion. The question of conversion of proselytes is indissolubly connected with the question of mixed marriage. But when a non-Jew has been converted, then every impediment against such marriage is removed. And there is, in fact, no mixed marriage. There is a marriage between two children of the living God, who are at the same time members of the household of Israel. Let us recapitulate.

It is not at all a question of race, but a question of religion. Not intermarriage do we object to, but mixed marriages Judaism prohibits. The Synagogue is opposed to a mixed marriage because it does not realize the ideal of marriage; because it is prejudicial to Judaism; because a Rabbi, as a religious functionary, can not officiate at it. The Jewish religion has a two-fold aspect—its universal truths and the consciousness of the relation in which Israel, servant of God, stands to them. If you will, it has a universally human element, an historical or racial element. Israel is a religious community, into which one enters by birth or by adoption. Some, emphasizing the historical or racial element, would make entrance more difficult, would logically be led to discourage conversion. For example, the contention of the great master, whose birthday we celebrate, David Einhorn, for whom I need not say, I have the utmost reverence, that it is necessary to guard jealously the racial qualities of the Jew, and thus to make impossible what he calls "*eine Beeinträchtigung des jüdischen Typus, ohne welchen wir notwendigerweise aufhören wird zu sein*" I can not assent to. Because such a conception would not only prevent mixed marriage, but logically carried out, prevent intermarriage, and is strictly speaking, in contradiction with Einhorn's own glorious conception of the mission of Israel. On the other hand, some emphasize the universal and religious element in Judaism and would make conversion less difficult. But no one denies that by accepting the religion, you become fully a member of the Household of Israel. Let then, therefore, conversion be encouraged, and thus a love, such as animated Ruth, will lead to increase in number of those who profess the Jewish religion and are loyal to Israel as a people and to Israel's God.

We have had enough of discussion. The Conference should take some action in the form of a resolution which, through the moral authority which it wields, will influence those individuals who are still inclined to use their Rabbinical office in solemnizing mixed marriages, which, as I have tried to prove, do not realize the ideal of marriage, and undermine the integrity

of Judaism as a religion and the vitality of Israel as a minority, and which, therefore, are not in the province of a representative of Judaism and Israel to perform.

Books consulted:

Holdheim "Maamar Haishoth" and Ueber die Autonomie der Rabbinen und das Princip der jüdischen Ehe."

Leopold Löw, Gesammelte Schriften, Band III.

Hirsch B. Fassel, Das Mosäisch-Rabbinische Civil-Recht, Band I.

Mielziner, Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce.

Jewish Times, Vol. I, 1870, for views of David Einhorn and Samuel Hirsch.

Rabbi Moses—From the spirit and the enthusiasm which accompanied the various striking sentences of the previous speakers I am reminded of a story which is told of a good, pious woman who listened for a long time to the disquisition of a preacher on the evidence of the existence of a God; and after the service was over she went out and said, "In spite of all that the preacher said I still believe in God." In spite of all that has been said, both from the historical and the religious point of view, I feel that you will go out and say: I still believe that mixed marriage is undesirable. If I take the stand to voice a few arguments that might sound as if I were taking a different position, I beg you to feel the same way when you go out, and that you will say, "I still feel that mixed marriage is undesirable." This is a discussion, and we ought not to run always in the same line of argument. I believe that the other side ought to be heard, and if I do not personally belong to the other side, I will try to do it justice first in regard to theory, and then, as this will soon resolve itself into an experience meeting, I shall state some personal experiences I have had during my ministry in the Jewish pulpit in America for the last thirty-five years. I see before me a few colleagues who

thirty years ago fought the same battle; that is, they fought the battle but did not fight it out, in which the present speaker and the President of the Union College, and Dr. Max Schlesinger, sitting here before me, and others who have been called from this earth, contributed their share. I therefore speak out of some experience on my part, and do not view it merely as an academic problem, but as a man who has faced the world, who has experienced much of it, watched much of its sorrow, who has stood before bridal couples that came to him in the perplexity of their hearts, and to whom I could not come with authorities and with theories, to whom I could not offer a logical theology, however acceptable that theology may seem to you, but to whom I had to come with my whole human heart and see what I could do in the perplexities that confronted them.

I am aware of the distemper of the Jewish people in regard to the whole problem. I have been told by some personal, influential friends, both of my congregation and others, that it is unwise for the rabbis to bring such a discussion before the public; they fear that publicity will rob this question of its terror and that it will encourage timid-hearted Jewish young men or women to conclude such a marriage, because they will only hear such argument as is favorable to their desire. And, besides, it is useless, it will be said, for this question has been decided. The most influential laymen have spoken emphatically and are speaking against any such marriages. Of course if an actual case should come before such an influential layman for decision, he will know how to lay down the law. If a troubled fellow-Jew should come to him and confide to him his trouble, that his son or daughter insists on marrying one outside of the fold, he will say, "You can't do that; it is against the Jewish law." Of course he knows the Jewish law. I fear his decision will not be so unerring if his own son or daughter came to him and said, "Father, I want your consent; I will marry this girl"—or, "I will marry this man." What will he do then? He will not be so sure of the Jewish law. He will go to the Rabbi and ask his opinion, and if the Rabbi has a fixed opinion,

immovable, "I can't do it," do you know what he will do if he is a prominent New York layman? He will engage one of the numerous justices of the Jewish faith. If he is inclined to be orthodox, why he will engage a judge from an orthodox congregation, and if he is more radical he will invite one of the judges who sides with his views; he will invite his friends and he will also invite his Rabbi. I speak of true facts. Not a thousand blocks away from these headquarters there was celebrated not long ago a marriage of this kind, and the gentle rabbi was present and drank the health of the couple—he did that in his capacity of an ordinary drinker. However, if this man is a sincere Jew, if he is a true believer and conscientious at heart, he will come to the rabbi and say, "Help me out of this difficulty;" and if the rabbi has a heart, and not merely a theology, he will consider, he will say, "Bring the parties to me and I will speak to them. Do *you* accept this non-Jewish party, will *you* adopt this young man into your family?" This is the first question to be settled, and from this point of view I perhaps emphasize more the racial or the family strength than the theological. The religious point will come, too. If possible we may induce the non-Jewish party to a formal conversion. You see it is necessary that we discuss the problem and that we take opposite sides.

Now I want to take up a few points of argument, not in refutation of what has been stated in the last paper, for I agree in most points with the views stated therein. Only in this point I differ, that I hold that a conversion is not the whole solution of all difficulties. The reader of the previous paper has assisted me in the ceremony of conversion, so-called conversion, as I have him.

Now as to the argument, let us take first the religious side. The phrase has often been used that we are not merely a religion, that we are something more than a religion, that we are a race plus a religion—we are a religious fraternity, but a fraternity of such strong racial ties that they can not very well be broken; that it is possible, as we have heard of

late, that a man can remain a Jew without Judaism—but it is impossible that Judaism can exist without the Jew. Now this phrase is akin to the other phrase, or rather dogma, which we have heard repeatedly, that Israel is a priestly nation, a priest-people. Now it is argued from analogy that as the priest of old dared not contaminate himself by marriage with others than those pointed out for him—the High Priest could only marry from his own kindred and kith and not from the common people—so, if the people of Israel as a nation is a priestly nation, they must not contaminate their sacred blood by an intermarriage or mixed marriage with those of a different race. I can bring you the evidence that *me'amor* means "his own kindred," at another time, if you will believe me for this moment. Now, if this is true, then proselytism would also have to be rejected, because the proselyte would adulterate the purity of the Jewish blood. But proselytes have always been accepted. They have not always been the lowest classes; sometimes they have been of the highest worthiness. The argument of the exclusive excellence, the superiority of the Jewish tribe, the Jewish race, if you want, although I dislike that word, proves too much, because if it were true that we are, or ought to be, a holy nation, we ought not to admit proselytes under any conditions, whether they accept Judaism or do not accept Judaism. But you have heard we have accepted proselytes. In our day the distinction between Jew and non-Jew is not so much that of religion as it is a distinction of race. At least from the outside we are taunted that we are a peculiar people; and the animosity is not directed against our religion as much as it is in reference to certain racial qualities. The antipathy on both sides, wherever it exists, is racial and not religious. The question is, what is dearer to us, The Race or the Religion? I hold we are a religion only and the race is incidental. Of course, in time any religious fraternity would form a race, a people, a type, whatever you call it, but I wish to urge that essentially we are a religion. The religion of Israel has grown on the stem of the Jewish people, but it is not identical with it. The

essential truths of Israel have become the possession of humanity. To claim superior virtue on the strength of a supposed common ancestry, is to mistake cause for effect. Israel became a distinguished tribe because his prophets proclaimed those eternal laws of faith and morality which have become a blessing to mankind.

It was the power of the peculiar religious idea, Monotheism, that made the Jewish nation. It was the power of that idea that broke the national mould when that mould no longer held the spirit. And this idea can create new moulds in which this spirit can find development. Simply because one is born of a Jewish mother does not entitle him, according to my Jewish consciousness, to the privilege of calling himself a Jew. Is it not about time that we became a little more serious with that expression, "The mission of Israel?" And when is there a time more appropriate? When is the opportunity more auspicious than when two persons come before a rabbi and ask the blessing of his religion to the covenant of their hearts, even if they belong to different faiths? And the one being nominally a Christian, says, "I wish to be married according to the Jewish faith." Then it is not for the rabbi to say, "First become a Jew and then I will talk to you," for this condition would compel the so-called Christian to become a hypocrite. If the rabbi has any heart he should say to that person: "You are to marry a Jewish girl," or, "You are to marry a Jewish man; you are to marry into a Jewish family. If the Jewish parents accept you, you become one of our religious fraternity. I do not wish you to declare belief in doctrines which you may not fully understand now, nor to swear off thoughts which you still hold dear, but I want you to pledge yourself to respect and uphold your wife (or husband) in the performance of her faith, and to rear your children in the religion of Israel." With or without formal conversion such a person should be accepted as a member of the household of Israel, and the marriage consecrated by the rabbi.

I will quote in support of my position from Dr. Fassel's "Das

Mosäisch-Rabbinische Civil-Recht," pg. 65, p. 41, who sums up the discussions on intermarriage when he says, "The question then is to be so decided: 'A marriage between a Jew and a non-Jew who has acknowledged the absolute unity of God, is allowable and may continue.'" He does not say the rabbi shall perform it, for this is a different question. For according to Talmudic law the rabbi does not consecrate the marriage, but the groom before witnesses says: "Be thou consecrated to me."

Let me tell you one concrete case that took place in Chicago, in my congregation. There was a conservative board of trustees which was dominated by a somewhat orthodox, very influential, pious, God-fearing man, now with the dead. A member of the congregation whose daughter insisted on marrying a Gentile, came to her father and said, "I will not marry anyone but this man, and if you will not allow me to converse with this young man, and that he shall visit our house, I will have to room somewhere else; I am independent, and am making my own living." He came to the Board of Trustees and said, "Gentlemen, shall I curse my daughter; shall I drive her out of my house?" "Oh," they said, "let the man be converted to Judaism first." He said, "Would I permit my daughter to be converted to Christianity if the other party demanded it? I ask of you, gentlemen of the board, that the rabbi be requested to perform this marriage ceremony." Love spoke truer than theology. It was a religious wedding; I did perform that marriage ceremony, according to the spirit of Israel, which says, "We have all one Father;" according to my Jewish conscience, which says, "I can not drive them away; I have to reach out my hand of fellowship to them," and according to the law of the land. And what was the consequence? They are members of the Congregation, and the rabbi from Chicago, my successor, will testify to this case, if I will mention to him the names. More such cases can be cited.

Let it not go forth from here either as law or as sentiment that modern Israel, that Reform Judaism, that the Central Conference of American Rabbis, is totally opposed to marriage be-

tween Jew and Gentile. Every case should be judged on its own merits, and the rabbi's hand should not be tied by a law to that effect.

NOTE: That the term מעמיו, wherever it occurs in Scripture, means "kindred," or "nearest relatives," is evident from Genesis xxiv, 8.

ויאסף אל עמיו And he (Abraham) was gathered to his kindred, not to his people in the sense of nation. Likewise Gen. xxx, 28, and xl, 32.

Lev. xxi, 1-2, shows clearly that the nearest relatives of the priest are meant. The construction is: לנפש לא יטמא בעמיו כי אם לשארו "He shall contaminate himself as regards his kindred *only* to his *nearest*, viz., mother, father, son, daughter, brother and unmarried sister." Sifra adds: מצוה So much for the construction of the positive command by a negative phrase לא כי אם.

In verse 4 לא יטמא בעל בעמיו the reference is to a common priest—shall not contaminate himself with the death of his *kinsfolk by marriage*—and Baal is used here as an adverbial noun, in his capacity as husband. For Baal cannot mean the high priest, as even the common priest dare contaminate himself *b'amo* only as they are שארו The high priest is specifically mentioned that he shall not contaminate himself at all: לכל נפש The legislator is explicit as to what degree of עמיו he means, namely, שארו that is, mother, father, etc. (note mother is mentioned first).

Verse 13 couples the injunction of proper marriage for the high priest to the law of contamination with the dead, as in both is the element להחלו, just as for the כהן הדיוט the same prohibition of marriage is added in verse 7 to the laws of contamination: אשה ונה וחללה וכ'.

In place of זרה must have stood originally זרה a non-priestly woman, whom he likens to a חללה, that is, a כהנת or a בת כהן who has lost priestly privilege—not through זנות for that brought death, but through some other cause—her father became חולל. The same refers to אשה נרושה מאישה, namely, a divorcee of a priest. The כהן הדיוט may marry the widow of a priest, but not his divorcee. The high priest, however, shall marry only a בתולה מעמיו a virgin from his own kindred; neither a divorcee of a priest, *not even* a widow of a priest; that is the meaning of putting אלמנה first: Neither widow, much less divorcee, etc.

וחללה זנה has no place here for the high priest, and must have originally read ובתולה זרה . Three degrees, or three classes of women: ¹a priestly widow (perhaps of the last high priest), ²his divorcee, ³a prominent layman's beautiful virgin daughter.

A daughter of an impoverished priest might condescend to marry a rich common Israelite, but a non-priestly Jewish girl, much less widow or divorcee, had little chance to marry a priest, much less a high priest. So בתולה מעמיו can mean only a virgin of his nearest kindred. I could go farther, and show how close the marriages often were in the priestly and royal families in and outside of Israel, but I fear to detract from my argument by carrying "too far."

E

THE SCOPE OF THE RELIGIOUS SCHOOL.

RABBI LOUIS GROSSMAN, CINCINNATI.

Let us clear up the question what the religious school means to do. In the first place, the religious school is not a substitute for the home. It can never be that, and if it aims to substitute it, it shifts the moral centre of child-life, and that would be calamitous. Religiousness needs the intimacy of kindred and the warmth of feeling, and it can not feed on mere information. The word may have great power, but it has power everywhere except in the realm of education. There the word must be winged with feeling, with the natural, not the assumed, feeling. The teacher can never substitute the parent. Parental influence is part of the historic influence. This is our capital. We are the people of moral genius; well, we are that from subtle causes. Our Judaism has gone into our flesh and blood; our domestic virtues, our law-abidance, our sympathies, our fellowship and the rest of those qualities which are so necessary under the exigencies of our tragic story, we did not get through formal instruction, and it is a vain hope that we can sustain them with text-books under the equally difficult conditions of today.

With respect to instruction in religion, as with regard to all education, there is nowadays an excessive trust in the power of the word. It is taken for granted that information brings reformation, that to tell about religion is to make religious. But nothing is farther from the truth. It is the mistake of all reform within modern Judaism, this blind expectation that somehow information constructs and builds. While the religious school has the duty to impart that mass of information which enlightened persons must possess, it is not true that the training of Jews is complete through mere information. The truths of

Judaism are not abstract principles, the personal note clings to them. And the history of the Jews is not a mass of dates and biographic detail; the atmosphere of passion, of suffering, of ideals, is in every chapter and in every incident. And it is in these that the educational force lies. It is not enough to have reasoned our children into the belief that there is a God. It is not enough, and it is not even religious to do that. A reasoned God is no God at all. I trace much of the current lassitude as to religious interests to the formal instruction of the last generation, which reasoned about everything. We must stop arguing about religion and Judaism in our religious schools. To tell Jewish children that there is a God, to tell them what they must believe is not adequate to the needs of their lives. They are to be recruited into the Jewish community, and their religion must be flesh and blood. As a matter of information, the Bible is being taught in the public schools. The Jewish school is not needed for that. Some public school teachers know how to tell the stories of the Bible with much more effect than our Jewish teachers can. But the Jew can tell of Moses and Joshua and David and Isaiah and Jeremiah and Ezekiel as no one else does. They are types of life, types of Jewish life, types of moral and religious truth. They exemplify what is attainable by you and me. Teachers believe that there is a certain pedagogic content in the mere telling of the stories, that when these stories have been told, the children might safely be let go, that then they have been fitted out for Jewish life. Nothing is farther from the truth. Stories are illustrations, and illustrations are never an end in themselves. They illustrate something, and exactly this something is the real aim. The children are sent to the religious school that they may learn about life, about Jewish life, how to live according to our moral and religious standards. The children are not sent to school for stories. Then again, there is a kind of teacher, represented mostly by rabbinical teachers, who preoccupy the field of religious instruction with catechism. They ascribe to definition in the catechism the wonder-working power of conviction. They

believe that when children have learned the terse statements about God and providence and future life and the rest, these somehow become equipment for life. They do not. The definitions become a drag, a hindrance, as all formal instruction does. The word will not save. The psychologic moment of a lesson is not when the child says: "I know," but when he says, "I will!"

The Bible gives us biographies, it gives family history, it gives national crises, it gives us messianic dreams. It shows us how difficult it is to cope with the realities of life, it shows us nobilities attainable by every human being, it portrays exemplars to emulate, and some exemplars to ignore. It brings before us the panorama of moral diversities, of strength and of weakness. It puts before us the plain facts of how men live on a high plane and how some live on a low plane. It sounds the depths of human nature and it flings open the portals of high and noble life. The Bible is an almost exhaustive account of how men in all ages and in all climes and, under the equal conditions of our common mortality, coped with moral difficulties and how they overcame them or succumbed to them. The theological aspect of the Bible does not tally with the pedagogic. The theological posits abstractions and final truths, the pedagogic sees concrete facts, and finds life in the Bible stories about the same as our life is. If the Bible is again to be the text-book of our religious education, we must have the right conception of what significance text-books have in the process of teaching. Theology is the most unpedagogic viewpoint possible. The stories of the Bible are serious stories of serious life; they have not been devised to point either a creed or a moral. They are repliques of life, such as our children, and all children in all ages must count with. And the Bible, of all Jewish books the most Jewish, reports to us Jewish life, the classical Jewish problem of life and the classically Jewish solution of our moral and religious problem. In a very definite sense the Bible is to be appraised not by the philosopher of religion, nor by the

dogmatist of a faith, but by the teacher. The ultimate verdict as to truth is rendered by him who teaches life.

So far the teacher of any faith, who has a real sense of life, will share the point of view with us. Only that the non-Jew will declare that all education aims at religious effect, and that therefore the specifically Jewish phase of influence is a household affair of our own. That may be so. Surely so, for as long as no existing denomination has committed itself quite so frankly as we to the sanctity and the sovereignty of human nature. Besides, we believe that the world is not yet quite so emancipated as impulsive radicals think. The Jew had something specific to do, or, at any rate, there is still good reason why he should cultivate his own moral values. We can not yet trust to the spirit of the times. This spirit of the times is vague and shifting and whimsical. The church-sense is not yet the religious sense, and the Jew is still outside of the sympathies and sometimes outside of the justice of the Christian world. And, however that may be, the Jew is conscious of this one fact (he may be wrong, but he believes it), that his religious genius and his moral genius are needed. And, finally, be that too as it may, the Jew feels that he needs for himself today the moral fibre of his ancestry. And so we cultivate our home-grown virtues and hope that they will do for us what they have done for our fathers, make us good to ourselves and a benefit to the world. But for this, the average instruction will not do. Firstly, because it does not go deep enough, and, secondly, because much that passes for information as to religious truth and history is wrong, consciously wrong as in church histories, and unconsciously in the current feeling as to Jew and Judaism. Secular instruction teaches the Bible and religion often to the injury and the insult of the Jew. From these we must protect at least our children.

We hear it said that the Bible is the common property of the world. Nothing is more misleading than that. If anywhere, just into understanding of the Bible the world has put all its prejudices and surely all its prejudices against the Jew.

The Jew can not take the world's judgment of the Bible. Nowhere is antisemitism so rampant and so insidious. If there were no other reason for the maintenance of Jewish Sunday Schools, it would be a sufficient reason that we must meet falsehoods which insinuate themselves into Jewish childhood from literature, public opinion and dominant sectarianism. Everybody is free to tell our story and everybody is free to abuse it for holy and for unholy reasons. Our children are perplexed and do not know whether we take ourselves seriously; they slip into the prevailing misunderstandings, and take the Christian world at its word and us at our silence. This is the most pathetic fact of our day; this allowing our patrimony to be at the mercy of our enemies. This has gone so far that our children must have recourse, when they do want to study Jewish literature and Jewish history, to Christian books and Christian authorities. I know of nothing sadder than this. Think of the great wrong we thus abet. We authorize the calumnies about ourselves. This must stop. We want Jewish teachers who should tell the truth. We want the truth about ourselves, told in sympathy and told with pride. We want our children to know the real facts of the Jewish tragedy.

The religious school has a duty to correct in the mind of the Jewish child the confusion as well as the errors which ages of polemics and intolerance have heaped up. That is a sufficient cause to enlist the interest and the co-operation of every self-respecting and thoughtful Jew. The surprise is not that we tell our children the threadbare stories of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and Moses and so on, but the surprise is that we do not put more intensity into the telling, as a people that feels the great wrong done to its sacred tradition. But by this I do not mean that the teacher should take his pupils into his confidence, or that he should give free rein to criticism. Even more than the truth as to our story and tradition, we need the truth as to our character. And not merely a vindication from aspersions, but the truth within ourselves, so that the old classical life of the Jew live up again in the children of today. That

would be the truth worth the vindication and a vindication worth the truth. We do not want to turn the Jewish school into an arena for the fighting out of the old fight, which, like the hydra, will forever have a thousand unkillable heads. But we do want the blossoming up of the religious genius, a revival of the priestly life, a resurrection of the Jewish spirit. I warn against discussions and criticisms in the Jewish school, and I plead for taking up the more needed work of training. If the world misunderstands us, the best correction we can give is, not a literary campaign, not a scholastic wrangle, not the old quarrel, but this—let us raise a moral generation, a Judaism sound and healthy in body and soul, a virile race, a people strong in virtue and sure and clean in character, a people at one with its fathers in moral truth. It is the school that must save and vindicate us. The story of Jewish martyrdom and of Jewish heroism and the story of Jewish home life means this and nothing besides. Every cause has had its martyrs and its heroes, but the Jewish martyrs are not mere evidences of what is a high reach under great excitements. They are types of life, types of the resourcefulness of the Jewish morality. They are not abnormal in the story of Jewish passion; they are normal; they are likely to occur again, and every Jewish child should be so trained that such virtues should seem matters of course. And unless our religious pedagogy allows for that sort of morality, it has no right to be. The commonplace virtues the public schools inculcate. The practicable virtues are very easily acquired and every common avenue of influences, of which there are so many in the modern life, makes for civic and social correctness. We want Jewish virtue if we want any. We want sane virtue, and we want high virtue, and our children shall stand out in the modern world by the sovereignty of the moral genius. That is a great demand but not an impossible one. At any rate, it is not an untraditional one.

The aim of the religious school is to establish right habits of living. And the aim of the Jewish school is to establish habits of the Jewish way of living. The Jewish school should

bring to the children the sense of right and the hate of wrong, not on the score of the proverbial moral philosophy, nor of the practical ethics of the day, but from an organic fact of Jewishness. We must construct the moral lay of the Jewish child, as the public school can not and would not, if it could. There is a flavor in Jewish morality, a moral uniqueness in Jewish character, which has made us staunch and invincible and that we must preserve. It is not enough for Jewish children to be honest. They must be honest for high reasons. Everything depends on the why and the wherefore. Our prophets and the later Jewish ethical teachers did not teach mere crude honesty, but a refined, a religious honesty, a sacred honesty, as it were. "Holy shall ye be, for holy am I, the Lord your God." We have a moral mission, we have an obligation to represent the highest reach of ethics, high in conception and high in performance. The Biblical stories signalize that. They have no sacramental character, as they have in Christian theology. The stories have an educational, a disciplinary meaning. We tell the stories because of their human truthfulness. And we tell them because we feel that the child-soul has a natural sympathy for them. The Bible is the best text-book of religion, because of the human truths that lie in it. The biblical stories do not prefigure life; they are life, the very life we find so hard and perplexing. And every man and woman in the stories is a type such as we may come across any day and anywhere, some such strength, some such weakness. Moses is regarded by the historian as an administrative genius, but for the teacher he is human, and very much like the men who pass by the schoolhouse. I marvel at the lack of insight of some teachers who persist in driving home the details of the Mosaic story, and fail to bring out the personality. Children hunger for heroes, and teachers give them dates and geography. Jewish tradition is not a mass of biblical archaeology, it is not a mass of customs, it is not a mass of doctrines. It is not merely reminiscent. Our tradition is living force. Tradition is a fact of the soul, or it is nothing. In theological days we talked much of tradition, and we meant

books and solemn days and pedantic observances. But tradition today mean living instincts. A book-Judaism is not Judaism, and a book-morality is no morality. A religious school in which Judaism is treated as originally alien to the soul is already at the start untrue. Judaism is not a creed we must learn and accede to. It is an aim, which our healthy instincts endeavor to attain.

But there is the purely educational, or shall I say the technical side of our subject. The life and the instincts of the child are different from those of the adult. The school deals with forming characters, not with complete ones. The school efforts must conform to child-character and not ignore it. There was a time when we knew of nothing else than adult religion. We know now that the child, too, has religion, its religion, and that it has phases of religious growth. Some teachers in our religious schools still operate on the plan of old time adult religiousness. They impute adult notions and adult capacities to the child; they do not know how nature works. According to these notions of the older religious psychology it is easy to draw up a course of study. Just so much must be taught from Creation to the Exile, in so many classes. It was a mere matter of sections of the historic material, for the first class from Adam to Abraham, for the second from Abraham through Jacob, for the third the rest of the story to David and so on, period by period for the respective classes. The material was the important matter, and the children were subjected to it. Nowadays we listen to the pulse-beats of growth. We know that the child first lives in a world of fancy. Or that, from another point of view, it first lives in an environment of the family. The child has a great moral problem in adjusting itself to home and family. Slowly the child grows out of the small world of its kindred into the larger and more complex world, in which strangers have a part, and the relations become wider and more numerous. And thus the child becomes the standard of the course of study, and the subject matter becomes adjusted to it and to its progressive stages of growth. It seemed formerly as if the child existed

for the sake of the school. But the truth is, the school exists for the child. Each one of the moral instincts which go into that bundle of reactions which we call character, passes through a process, from the simple to the complex, and we should be very much off the line of real human nature, if we should fail to see that.

The child's God belief passes through stages of growth; the child's sense of justice has a history; the child's respect for law has a history; the child's sense for mine and thine passes from the crude appropriation stage to discriminating sense which respects what belongs to another even in his absence. So also sympathy, obedience, and all the qualities which unfold in the course of life. The modern teacher knows that the worship of the heroic sets in at a certain epoch of childhood, not sooner and not later than when the child has become conscious of powers slumbering in him and feels them awake. He knows that admiration and loyalty come at well-marked periods of life and that then it is the opportunity of the teacher to refine and deepen the natural instincts which declare themselves thus. The course of study must consult these natural streams of growth. It is absurd how some schools force subjects upon children against the grain of their growth. Here a reform must set in. For the present practice is not only confusion, but also violence, confusion of pedagogic effort and violence to the holy rights of child-life. And as to Jewish childhood as well, there must be more discrimination. Aside from the child-epochs, which, of course, Jewish children have equally with all childhood, there is in addition a Jewish phase due, no doubt, to the subtle influence of Jewish history. For, as the evolution of the child-life recapitulates human evolution, so Jewish history also, on its part, is recapitulated in the Jewish child. I can not follow out this thought here and now. The Jewish teacher should scent this distinctive quality of Jewish childhood and this specific strain in the development of the child-life among Jews. For my part, my investigations into the subject lead me to posit the following:

The first stage of growth in Jewish childhood is marked by

family morality; the second by personal relations. The third opens contact with fellowship. The fourth is typified by a struggle toward law, while the fifth, passing out of law as enforced by society and conditions, chooses the higher kind of authority, higher from the point of view of ethics, the law of the free self. In the sixth, the character widens the scope of interests and enters upon co-operation, while the last, stepping into the open world of adult life, has cast forth wide circles of relation and interest, becoming a conscious member of the community. I find also that the Bible from this point of view of progressive moral growth receives a wonderful endorsement. There is no truer book of pedagogy than the Bible.

At first we have the account of three patriarchal families, comporting with the family instincts of childhood. Next we have personalities, Joseph, Moses, the historic parallel to the boy who begins to feel that he can do things. And then how ancient Israel struggles out of moral chaos into order and the rule of law, almost as the average child works out its moral life-problem by the alternation of rebellion and conformity. Till, as in the story of Israel, under the stress and storm of exile and under the whip of prophetic idealism, the Jewish people has learned the hard but useful lesson of self-control. And what is the medieval period but a time of discipline for co-operation and of the saving of moral energy, which might otherwise have been frittered away, and finally the Judaism of the modern day, what else is it for the teacher, but a time of adjustment, of moral adjustment for larger kinship, for more universalistic life! The Bible gives us an epitome of the moral history of the Jewish people, and later Jewish history completes the great historic discipline. But be that as it may, this much, at any rate, is fixed in the matter of a course of study for the religious school, as for that of the public school, the subject matter taught must consult the moral condition of the pupil who is to be taught. It will not do any more to cut the subject into bits and parcel these out in the order of the cuttings. There is a higher law than that of theology, and that is the law of child-growth. That

comes out of the hand of nature, which the other had better consult and respect.

Again, the law of child nature demands that the education of the child should be a unit. It will not do, it is a contradiction, of one of the principles of education, to break up the moral life of the child into parts. That the religious school was outside of the general educational influence, that the religious training was a side issue, was one of the first serious mistakes. All the parts of educational efforts must be homogeneous, or else the lack of organization will do mischief. I know it is difficult to bridge over the gulf which has been made between the public school and the religious school, but we must do the best we can to compensate for the break. One of the absolute needs for this is to see to it that the Sunday-School runs parallel with the public school. The educational life of the child, all through its successive class-stages, should be of one piece. Teachers in the Sabbath-Schools should be familiar with what their Sunday pupils do during the week. And the course of study in the Sunday-School should comport with that which the children have in the public school. This I urge for the sake of the unity of the child-life and the unity of pedagogic influence, and I urge it also because as Jews we have so much corrective work to do, and it is opportune while the children are being impregnated with anti-Jewish information, that we come to the rescue of truth and of Judaism.

My thesis, accordingly, is that if teaching is in our day the only means we have for securing the continuity of Judaism and of Jewish life, it behooves us to give to the methods of teaching and to the aims of teaching ampler thought and wider opportunities. The religious school is recognized as an essential agency for life, and we should make it effective by every means at our command. We are in an epoch of transition. Till now we were under the constellation of the sermon and the prayerbook. We are now coming into the constellation of the school. And the present epoch is better. The sermon could edify, but it could not construct. Reform has at most made

worship more tolerable, possibly also more desirable. But reform could not make morality more ideal, nor character more sounder. But the religious school has a great opportunity. It may construct a better Judaism because it can train better Jews. In this most effective reform there can be no division; there can be no parties; in the cause of education we can unite and work together. The new cause of the religious school will usher in a fine period of co-operation. The orthodox and the reformer have equal obligations and an equal opportunity. No one is quite so free as is the teacher, say the Rabbis. Talmud Thora above all, they declared.

F

A REVIEW OF TEXT-BOOKS FOR ETHICS.

RABBI NATHAN KRASS, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

The object of this review is to give a statement concerning the books on Jewish ethics that are available for Sabbath-School purposes. I must say, by way of preface, that this task was assigned to me very recently and that I got together this review under considerable pressure. This stack of books you see was sent to me by the Bloch Publishing Co., and I have gone through these books very carefully, and shall give you my impression of them. I feel like the prosecuting attorney who is up in the courtroom for the condemnation of his particular friend.

In general, I may say concerning these books, that I do not find them exclusively devoted to Jewish ethics, though they contain some chapters on that subject. They are not by any means ideal or even always first class. The authors of a great many of these books are personal friends of mine, and what I have to say this morning is uttered without malice and purely in the interest of science and truth. I wish to state, in the first place, as far as the composition of these books is concerned, that the authors, perhaps, under the influence of Germanic philology, have not given sufficient care to correct English sentences. In other words, the language is not particularly choice or good. Furthermore, the contents have not been jotted or written or composed with sufficient accuracy. There are a number of "lapsus calami." For instance, in one of the pamphlets, as a friend pointed out to me, there is a statement regarding Pass-over to the effect that the first and last days are the holy days, and the other days are ordinary week days, ignoring the intervening Sabbath. Again, these books contain a large amount of matter that does not refer to Jewish morals at all.

The first book I hold here is "Young Israel's Guide," by Rabbi

Bernard M. Kaplan. This, according to the foreword, is not a guide in Jewish ethics; it is a compilation of prayers and a record of fast days, and states, for instance, that the fast of Esther is a fast day kept by pious Jews. As we do not keep it we are not pious Jews, is the inevitable inference.

"A Sabbath-School Companion for Jewish Children," by Rabbi Adolph Guttmacher. This contains in a brief form what the Bible is, the Apocrypha, the Talmud, the Jewish faith, the Ten Commandments, the Dietary Laws, etc. This, according to the author, is a guide, not a book in Jewish ethics.

"Israel's Religion, a Catechism for Sabbath Schools," by Rev. J. S. Goldammer, Ph. D. In the preface the author says this book is intended for children between ten and twelve years of age. The book touches on almost every law, purpose and principle embraced by religion. We do not believe in the question and answer method, because it is too mechanical.

Then there is another book, "A Brief Manual regarding the Jewish Faith and Life," by Rudolph Grossman, which consists largely of the Jewish calendar, the names of the books of the Bible, a few prayers, etc. It is not a book we can get very much from in the line of ethics.

We come to Isaac M. Wise's catechism. In that book there are only twenty pages devoted to the consideration of Jewish ethics. These deal largely with the duties of man. Since most of you are familiar with this book it is not necessary to go through it.

Like it is Dr. Kohler's book, "Guide for Instruction in Judaism." Both Wise's and Kohler's books have been used by rabbis with discrimination with their confirmation classes. It is a different thing when these books are placed in the hands of Sunday-School teachers. In Dr. Kohler's book only chapter 3, forty-seven pages, deals with what we would call Jewish ethics.

I have another volume, N. F. Josephs' "Israel's Faith." A good deal is spiritualized or sublimated theology, perhaps useful of its kind; only one chapter deals with the moral duties and

one with the social duties. It does not propound its view from the standpoint of modern Judaism.

I still have another volume to review, that is by Greenstone, "The Religion of Israel." The chapter on ethical laws contains twenty-three pages. The dietary laws receive religious emphasis, and it is difficult to differentiate between the moral value of an ethical law and a ceremonial law.

This is Friedlander's thin book, an emaciated form of his thicker volume. This abridged form is perhaps useful for those who can not go to sources and want to look up what a term like *kashruth* means. I do not think they have to go to this book to learn what the love of our fellowman means. The book is written from the orthodox point of view, and therefore it is unavailable for use in our Sabbath-Schools.

So when we sift all the books sent me for review down to the bottom—they all have bottoms—they are not so very profound—they are all unavailable as text-books in the hands of teachers for the teaching of ethics in our Sunday-Schools, with the exception of Drs. Kohler's and Wise's books, which are useful as helps in confirmation classes taught by the Rabbis.

I come to the last book before me, that of Dr. Krauskopf and Dr. Berkowitz. I have found out that this book has been discarded in Dr. Krauskopf's Sunday-School. If it were valuable he would have used it in his own school. It consists largely of a series of sentences strung together in a more or less uniform way as to Bible ethics. For instance, "Say nothing against your neighbor unless you can say something that is good; never flatter," and quotations. I tried it in my own Sabbath-School. It is not useful in the hands of a teacher. It is a text-book full of texts, not a text-book in the sense of a guide book in the Sunday-School.

I know something can be said in favor of these books. I hope the attorneys for the defense will say it. I have looked into these books with considerable care. Up to date we have not, from the modern point of view, a text-book in ethics which is available for the Sabbath-School. This brings up the all im-

portant question: Is it necessary to have a text book in Jewish ethics? Is it not perhaps better that the lesson of Jewish ethics be taught by the indirect method rather than by the direct way? I remember in an examination in ethics at the university, some students cheated, which goes to prove that an intellectual conception of what ethics is and a willful acceptance of what ethics is are two distinct things. I may know what is right and not do it. The object of the Sunday-School is training the will, making boys and girls ethical unconsciously, teaching them the ethics of Judaism indirectly and without too much obviousness.

Rabbi Berkowitz—Rabbi Krass had but little time for the preparation of his paper, and as a consequence I was unable to be informed of its nature in advance, so that I am only prepared in that degree in which you are all prepared, having listened to what he has had to say and made up your mind in regard to it. For myself I wish to confess **את הטאטא איז מוכיר היום** "Today I remember the sins of my youth;" for having just passed out of the College doors I spent a vacation with Dr. Krauskopf in compiling "Bible Ethics." Well, though that book has now been discarded in my own school, as well as in his, I believe, in all sincerity and earnestness that it had justified itself. All these books, which have been found inadequate for our use, demonstrate the groping in the minds of those who have been seeking for some satisfactory solution of our problem. I find myself in accord with Rabbi Krass's view. He suggested that we would do better without text books, to teach Jewish ethics effectively. There are two methods of teaching, the direct and indirect. These text-books represent an effort to teach ethics by a direct method—to embody in definite statements the duties of life and principles of conduct. The indirect method is the instruction in ethics which we receive without text-books in all the walks of life, from birth to death. It is in this way our characters are formed, rather than from text-books.

The main issue before us is, How are we to differentiate ethics in general from Jewish ethics in particular? The function of

the religious schools which we control must be clearly defined in order that we may understand what that is with which we would have our children familiar and by which we would have their characters formed. All the ethics possible should be taught in the public school; but the distinct function of the religious school, whatever the religion, is to make the children learn the grounds of morality. We stand out against sectarian instruction in secular schools because we do not wish to have our children taught by others what are the grounds of ethics. That is a privilege we reserve to ourselves, for we have our own distinctive Jewish sanctions of morality and modes of impressing them. What is it that distinguishes our Jewish morality? I believe, as the outgrowth of our long history, we have a certain foundation of morality which is our own. We have no mere utilitarian teaching—be honest because it is the best policy. We have no mere speculative philosophical basis for right doing. We have no infallible pope. We have no infallible book. We do not declare the Bible to be inspired literally in every word. We have nevertheless authority for our morals. It lies in the revelations of righteousness in the events of our great history and in the lives of our prophets, martyrs, heroes and sages. It is the crystallization of our Jewish ethics into actual institutes of life, like our great festivals, each an inspiring instrumentality for moral instruction. When we teach the Passover and make the child take part in its observance, that vitalizes the great principles of freedom, of justice and a host of other principles of ethics. Make the Jewish life real to our children, not something far away; make it something to be lived now and here and you will inspire the child with love and devotion to principle. In this the text-books have failed. It is the living personality of parent, teacher or friend whose enthusiasm and example alone can make the teaching effective.

G

OUR BIBLICAL HISTORIES.

RABBI JOSEPH S. KORNFELD, COLUMBUS, O.

As far back as the year 1890, at the first annual convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, held in the city of Cleveland, a committee of three was appointed to examine all the then existing Biblical histories with the view to recommending such as in their judgment were most serviceable as text-books in our religious schools. At the same meeting Dr. E. Schreiber read a paper on "How to Teach Biblical History," the substance of which he summed up in a resolution "That the Central Conference of American Rabbis appoint a committee to publish a Biblical history on the basis of Biblical science." The aforementioned committee having been appointed before Dr. Schreiber presented his views on the subject, it is rather difficult to know whether they, too, regarded Biblical science the determining factor in the selection of a text-book. Nor does it matter very much what they thought, as they never reported. That the Conference had not taken any further action indicates either that they did not deem this matter very urgent or that they were confident that in the struggle for existence the fittest would survive. In view of the earnestness with which this body has studied every problem of Jewish interest, the latter presumption is more fair and plausible.

That the question of a text-book on Bible history is one of utmost importance has long since been recognized. In "Die Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben" in 1875, in a review of Richard Wagner's "Das Judenthum in der Schule," the immortal Geiger says, "Und hier müssen auch wir offen gestehen, dass hier ein wunder Fleck auch für die Bekenner des Judenthums ist. Denn es bleibt immer bedenklich, wenn in die Kindesseele nicht bloss kritisch sehr Bestandetes als Thatsache,

und zwar als heilige, als Lehrsatz gelegt wird, sondern auch Thatsachen und Lehren, die nicht frei von sittlichem Anstosse sind, bald als Anleitung fürs Leben gegeben, oder doch Männern beigelegt werden, für die die höchste Verehrung verlangt wird. Auch ich bekenne mich daher ohne Scheu zur Ansicht, dass der Unterricht in der biblischen Geschichte auch für die Kinderwelt unter den Juden einer sehr wesentlichen Umgestaltung, namentlich der Beschränkung im Inhalt und Umfang, bedarf, dass die genauere Bekanntschaft mit derselben dem Zeitpunkt grösserer Reife vorbehalten bleiben, zu welchem dann auch alsbald zu einer unbefangeneren Auffassung angeleitet werden kann."

However we may differ from Geiger as to the pedagogical soundness of eliminating from our text-books the weaknesses of our Bible heroes, we can not but recognize, even more fully than he could, the need of a Bible history written on the basis of historical science—if not necessarily "on the basis of Biblical science." By Bible history we understand the history of Israel in Bible times, just as by post-Biblical history we mean the history of Israel after Bible times. And in this critical age it is hardly to be expected that Bible history will be exempted from those tests by which the value of all other histories is measured.

Whatever other criteria history may have, the one universally accepted is that the material dealt with should be facts. In the words of Professor Hinsdale, "The staple or subject matter of history is facts." Of course, facts are not all of the same kind. "There are," says Guizot, "moral, hidden facts which are not less real than battles, wars and the public acts of government. Besides these individual facts, each of which has its proper name, there are others of a general nature, without a name, of which it is impossible to say that they happened in such a year or on such a day, and which it is impossible to confine within any precise limits, but which are just as much facts as the battles and public acts of which we have spoken." That a Bible history necessarily abounds in facts of this kind does not therefore detract from its worth and dignity as history.

But when it places the hall-mark of Truth on miracles, myths and legends by declaring them to be the word and work of God, then it forfeits its claim to the title of history, even in its broadest connotation. And even that part of its contents which, had it stood by itself would never be doubted, when linked with stories whose mythical nature is beyond question can not but suffer from this sinister association. The truth of this statement was shown at the last Conference of the Ohio Jewish Religious Education Association when a young woman of no mean attainments, a teacher of exceptional ability and large experience in charge of a Sabbath-School in the city of Cleveland, appealed to the rabbis to point out to the teachers which parts of the Bible history are to be taught as historical and which as being merely mythical. That this ambiguity exists in all our text-books no one who has read them will attempt to gainsay. Nor will it be removed until we realize the fundamental difference between the Bible and Bible history. Until then we shall have deformed Bibles but no Bible histories.

The Bible is a philosophy of history, whereas Bible history is a history based on Biblical records or data, and, of course, where they cease it ends. That the Bible writer believed that he was dealing exclusively with facts is no doubt true. Yet it is equally true that the connection concerned him more than the action. The essential thing in the Bible is the theory of the universe it furnishes, viz., the supreme sovereignty of the Divine. This is the underlying principle of the Bible, and the Biblical contents derives its value not from its historicity but from the emphasis it places on this sublime truth. Accordingly the miracle, far from being an element of weakness, is the very thing that gives majesty to the Bible; since it proclaims, as nothing else could, the reign of spiritual law in the natural world. But this same miracle, unless recorded merely as an expression of a belief in a spiritual power superior to the laws of nature, is manifestly out of place in a history. The Bible, therefore, whether paraphrased or abridged, may not be used as

a text-book of either an ecclesiastical or general history of Israel in Bible times.

However, though itself not a history, the Bible contains almost all the material for such a history. Apart from the unquestionably historic events scattered throughout the Bible which need but be given organic unity to become a history of Israel in Bible times, those marvelous tales and stories usually taught mainly as moral and religious lessons, are themselves essential parts of the national history of Israel. They are the products of that age in the life of Israel when nothing was too wonderful to take place, and when the hero towered so high that his head touched heaven. The story, however fanciful, was fact to the people of the story age; and such it is to the child of the story age today. Hence, in the beginning of school life the stories of the Bible, in their original form, should be the material of instruction in the study of Israel's history just as the most imaginative tales and adventures constitute the beginning of the study of American history for the American child. On the other hand, when the child has passed the story and hero age then the story must become folklore and much of the heroic legend. Yet the Biblical narratives are not thereby deprived of their historic value. Indeed, they are very important, because they shed much light on the genius of the people that first gave them utterance. The only difference is that whereas in the story they were taught as real, in the history they are ideal. Then they were true objectively, now subjectively.

Such a treatment of the Biblical material would give us a graduated course of lessons in the history of Israel as serviceable as is at the command of the teacher instructing the child in American history, and the results would be as gratifying. The text-book, being an essential factor in the study of history, we can readily understand that in the absence thereof, effective work in this most important branch in our religious school curriculum is well nigh impossible.

That at the present time and more especially for the Reform Jewish child the knowledge of Israel's history is of the utmost

importance can not be questioned. To quote S. M. Dubnow, "In our days when the liberal movements leavening the whole of mankind, if they have not completely shattered the religious consciousness, have at least, in an important section of Jewry effected a change in its form; when abrupt differences of opinion with regard to questions of faith and cult are asserting their presence; and traditional Judaism developed in historical sequence is proving powerless to hold together the diverse factors of the national organism—in these days the keystone of national unity seems to be the historical consciousness." While we may not accept the implications of some particular words used by the author, we can not but endorse his statement as a whole. The best, if not the only, way to avert the danger of assimilation that threatens our children is to acquaint them with that Israel has done and not so much what was done for Israel. Everywhere they hear of the contributions of Greece and Rome, of the blessings of Christian civilization and, unless they acquire an equally high, if not higher, regard for what Israel has given to the world, they can never be truly proud of their heritage. A history that will counteract these disintegrating influences should be a marvelous but not a miraculous account of Israel. It should be a record, not of divine intervention, but of the development of the spiritual within Israel as natural as was the development of the distinctive genius of other nations of ancient and modern times.

An examination of the Biblical histories, quite generally used in our religious schools, leaves no room for doubt as to their inadequacy to accomplish the desired object. In case of most of them it is hardly credible that they were ever intended for historical study. The story-books, one should judge, were written for little sinners and the histories for big simpletons. With a few notable exceptions—and these from the pens of non-Jewish writers—our Bible story-books will not appeal to the imagination of younger children and the Bible histories will not commend themselves to the serious consideration of older children.

Of non-Jewish authors the following books are knocking at the door of or have already gained admittance into Jewish religious schools:

Dean Hodges—"The Garden of Eden."

James Baldwin—"Old Stories of the East."

H. A. Guerber—"The Story of the Chosen People."

Theo. G. Soares—"Heroes of Israel."

Walter L. Sheldon—"Old Testament Bible Stories for the Young."

"The Bible Study Union (Blakeslee) Lessons."

"The Garden of Eden," by George Hodges, comprising the stories from Creation to the death of Saul, is an ideal story-book. Bible stories these, not sermonettes. They are told not as a means to something else, but as an end in itself, that being to make the child think the thoughts and feel the emotions of the people of Israel when they were of his age intellectually. A story that will make the heroic past live again in the child required no explanation after it nor preaching into it. It is the simplest thing to the child's mind and the most spiritual thing for the child's heart. As told by Dean Hodges, the Bible stories possess untold charm and fascination. To be sure, there are many strange things in these stories. But what of that? "This," to use the words of our story teller, "you understand was very long ago when strange things happened, as they do in fairy tales." And the child of the story age implicitly believes in fairy tales. Since nothing seems impossible, there is no need of an explanation. Only once does the writer disillusion his young reader, and that, in the story of the Witch of Endor, when he says "this strange belief (in witches) is now held only by ignorant and superstitious persons." The author doubtless feared lest the belief in witches become indelibly fixed in the mind of the young child naturally loving the weird and mysterious. But what is most remarkable is that in spite of the explanation, as a rule so detrimental to the realism of the story the latter is so well told that one can still hear a real

voice saying, "And tomorrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me."

That the pictorial illustration of the story is of great pedagogic advantage is universally recognized. And there are very few Bible story-books without pictures; but very often the latter are decidedly inartistic and even more frequently in no wise psychologically related to the story as interpreted by the writer. In "The Garden of Eden" the stories admirably told are also most artistically illustrated by Walter H. Everett. His pictures are concrete and show action. The mystical and abstract are studiously avoided. Only once does he choose a theme we are wont to regard as being almost incapable of portrayal, viz., the Burning Bush. But the artist has eminently succeeded by giving it an entirely new interpretation. For him the burning bush is merely an incident, while Moses is the central theme. He pictures Moses in a meditative mood. The future deliverer stands in awe, not of what is before him, but of what is ahead of him. Moses, overwhelmed by the greatness of the task that awaits him, is wondering—"How?"

In this book, well named "The Garden of Eden," for the naivete and freshness that mark it throughout, both the writer and the artist have done excellently, for the simple reason that they allowed the little child to lead them.

One should imagine that Bible story-books written for the public school would be of exceptional value as text-books in Jewish religious schools. Their purpose being purely literary or historical, we should naturally expect their treatment to be strictly objective and at the same time showing the utmost regard for the age and apperception of the child for whom they are intended. Accordingly, James Baldwin's "Old Stories of the East" and H. A. Guerber's "The Story of the Chosen People," being of the Series of Eclectic Readings for children in the public school, ought to be ideal story-books for our religious schools. But such is hardly the case.

In order not to "trespass on the domain of the religious teacher," the author of "Old Stories of the East" has resorted

to the rather novel device of using the Hebrew names as sparingly as possible, giving us, instead, their English equivalents. So that in the place of Isaac and Rebecca we have "Laughter and Beauty." For Deborah we have "Bee," because, we are told, "that was the name given to wise women and singers of songs." The Philistines are "The Wanderers," while the Israelites are "The Children of the Prince." As a rule, the Hebrew translation is found at least once in course of the story. But, unless one is a Hebrew scholar he will find it difficult to identify "Troop," "Judge," "Praise," "Stone Quarry Mountain," as the writer must have discovered in their Hebrew equivalents some hidden theological bias and not wishing to "trespass on the domain of the religious teacher," banished them from his book. It is, therefore, rather amusing to find that the author did not hesitate to say "the spot on which Ruth's house stood is still shown the traveler in the East, for it is the spot where a thousand years later the Christ child was born."

An additional reason for the preference for the English equivalents of the Hebrew proper names is that thereby these stories are given a "flavor of newness." This is undoubtedly true and may have its advantage. Laughing Water is certainly more modern than Minnehaha. Yet an Indian story will lose much of its native freshness by giving up the Indian name. Just so the old stories of the East should not be made to sacrifice their oriental flavor for the sake of the rather doubtful benefit of acquiring the "flavor of newness." But whatever may be our opinion of this modernization from a literary standpoint, there can be no doubt as to its fatal effects, if these stories are to be used for historical study. Everything the child learns in the story is to serve as a preparation for history, and its retention should be rendered, not as difficult, but as easy as possible. Now, it is not likely that the mention of Goliath in history will recall to mind the "Exile" in the story or that Samson in history will at once remind the child of "Splendid Sun" in the story.

Another shortcoming of this book as a text-book for historical study is that it is decidedly too eclectic. Of all the stories between Creation and the reign of David, it contains the following: "The Garden of Delight," "The Two Brothers," "The Flood of Waters," "The Great Chief," "The Master of the Land of Egypt," "The Great Law Giver," "The Man Whose Eyes Were Open," "The Bee and the Gazelle," "The Idol Breaker," "The Story of the Splendid Sun," "The Story of Harvest Time," and "The Shepherd Boy Who Became King." If the writer had not given his book the appearance of a complete single narrative, thereby leading us to believe that here we have the chief events in the life of the Hebrew people during that period, then the selection of these stories might have been justified on the ground that in them he had found more of the essential elements of a good story than in the rest of the Biblical original. But as it is, the child will naturally conclude that whatever is omitted is comparatively insignificant, which, of course, would be very misleading.

Nevertheless, we can not be too grateful to the author for the few stories he has given us, as they make truly delightful reading—something that can not be said of many Bible story-books. If he only had not felt it his mission to modernize! Then there might still be standing in the Garden of Eden the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil and not an "apple tree," and instead of the prosaic, "They gave him congratulations and wished him many blessings and prayed that Ruth might also be blessed, and that their family might bring honor to their country and be famous in Bethlehem," . . . we should have these words so full of oriental dignity: "Jehovah make the woman that is to come into thy house like Rachel and like Leah, which two did build the house of Israel, and get thee power in Ephrathah and be famous in Bethlehem."

"The Story of the Chosen People," by H. A. Guerber, is an account of Israel's history from its beginning, which, according to all Sabbath-School historians (?), means the beginning of the world, to the destruction of the Temple by the Romans.

As a matter of course, anyone writing a book for the public school, must state in the preface that he is writing objectively. This the author has done. But how dismally he failed in the task he set for himself is shown already in the ill-chosen title of his book. "The Story of the Chosen People" will naturally call for an explanation of the phrase, "Chosen People." And our author is quite equal to the occasion. He says, "The Jews are a Chosen Race because God gave His laws to this people and said that the Messiah would be born among them." The disavowal of any attempt "to dwell on the religious side of this subject" sounds ridiculous in the face of the many evidences to the contrary. Thus, for instance, the Creation story concludes with these words: "It is partly because God rested on the seventh day, after laboring six days, that we work six days of the week and rest on the seventh; and each Sunday is thus an anniversary of God's day of rest." In the story, "The Forbidden Fruit," we read "Unfortunately, however, there was an evil spirit called the Temptér, the Devil, or Satan" Note these innocent capitals! The third story contains the following objective statement: "Although Adam and Eve suffered keenly for their disobedience, they did not despair. They believed God's Word and began to look forward to the time when the promised child would come who, by killing the serpent, would make up for the harm they had done. The mention of this child is the first prophecy about the Messiah, or Redeemer; and from the day she left Eden, Eve lived in constant hope of his coming." Commenting on God's promise to Abraham, the author says: "These last words, as you can see, contained a new promise of a Redeemer, like the one made to Adam, and God now added the information that this Redeemer would bless the Gentiles—that is to say, the people who did not belong to the Chosen Race." A great many more passages could be cited, if additional evidence were needed, to show how thoroughly objective the writer made his story. Without questioning his sincerity in stating that "Not the least attempt has been made to dwell upon the strictly religious side

of the subject," one can not but feel that it was a prudential consideration and not a principle that kept him from making "The Story of the Chosen People" a fine religious tract. The only reason for his not doing so was that such an attempt would have been "impracticable." It is quite likely that had he been guided by the conviction that religion has no place in the public school, even if such an attempt were practicable, he might have done much better. As it is, "The Story of the Chosen People" may be very useful in a Christian Sunday-School, but it is out of place in a public school.

That this book, written from a Christian standpoint, is utterly useless in a Jewish religious school goes without saying. Nor need one regret that such is the case, because, even without this defect, there is nothing in the book that would especially commend it as a text-book for historical study. As a story-book it has only one merit, namely, that of being written in simple language. It lacks every other essential characteristic of a good story. It is neither realistic nor picturesque, neither dramatic nor imaginative. On the other hand, as a history, even though it purport to be only a "juvenile history of the Jews," it deserves scant consideration, chiefly for the reason that throughout events are recorded as historic which do not flow from ordinary historic causes, and for that reason can not have the force of history.

How vastly different from the book just described is "Heroes of Israel," by Theodore Gerald Soares! One fails to find in its preface the assurance that it was written objectively. No doubt because it was not written for the public school. But one needs only peruse this book to realize that it is the work of a scholar who appreciates the *intrinsic* value of Bible stories and Bible heroes. "Heroes of Israel" contains the lives of Israel's heroes from Abraham to Daniel, besides the extra Biblical hero, Judas the Hammerer. Each one is described in the different roles he played in the various situations found in the Bible. For instance, we have "Joseph the Slave," "Joseph the Ruler," and "Joseph the Generous;" or, "Elijah the Cham-

pion of Pure Religion," and "Elijah the Champion of Justice," etc. This is accomplished by collating all those Biblical passages (Apocrypha in the case of Judas the Hammerer) wherein the particular characteristic of the hero is shown. Naturally, we have only heroic language. Whatever is miraculous is neither rationalized nor explained. And why should it be? Are not these *heroes* of Israel? And is there anything too great for the hero to do, or too wonderful to happen to him? All that is needed is a heroic age, and that is preeminently the child's age.

In addition to those stories which make up the character portrait, this book also contains others without which we should have but a fragmentary knowledge of the life of the hero. And here also, with the exception of a verbal change or omission of a difficult name that might mar the interest of the story, the Bible tells the tale. In order to stimulate study, there are explanatory notes, as well as instructions for written review.

Although intended for older children, there is no reason why a young child should not read this book with equal pleasure and profit. "Heroes of Israel" may well be considered a valuable contribution, not only to the "Constructive Bible Studies," to which it originally belongs, but also to the constructive Bible history series, so sadly needed in the Jewish religious schools.

In striking contrast to the concise and elevated style of this book we have the prolix, and at times very prosaic style of the "Old Testament Bible Stories for the Young," by Walter L. Sheldon. That this book should be at all used for the teaching of Bible history simply proves what a confusion of thought there is on this subject. We have the author's own instruction repeated again and again, "Use these stories as the means for teaching the rudimentary principles of ethics, for the purpose of arousing the latent ethical sense of the child." Surely there must be some difference between Ethics and History!

His object in relating these stories being to bring home to the child the lesson, "Be sure your sin will find you out," it

naturally devolves upon the author to point it out where it is not evident in the Biblical original. Consequently, we have here a running commentary on the Biblical narrative from the Creation to the reign of Solomon. And while not indifferent to the letter and spirit of the Bible, the reflections and observations of the author are so numerous, that the realism and vividness of the stories in their original are materially weakened.

A striking feature of these stories is the absence of the word "God." Whenever the Deity is referred to it is always the titles "Lord," "Lord over All," "Ruler," and "Great Ruler;" the reason for this being that in this way, to quote the author, "the generic term God is left for the time when the young person approaches the theistic attitude of the prophets." One is inclined to think that here the author is rather pedantic. For the very reason that it is generic, the term God has been and will be used by people who never did and never may "approach the theistic attitude of the prophets."

It would have been far better if he had spoken of God as God, the Master Worker; God, the Almighty Ruler; God, the Righteous Judge; God, the Loving Father, as He respectively revealed himself in the different narratives. That would at least teach the child the evolution of the conception of God. But never to mention God in a religious school is, to say the least, somewhat surprising.

At the end of each story a note is addressed to the teacher directing his attention to the essential points and possibilities of the story to convey an ethical lesson. When there is no possible chance of extracting a moral out of the story, its study is still urged on the ground that its language or details "have entered intimately into the details of Christendom."

Unlike most writers giving memory verses, Sheldon has not taken his from the Bible in general, but from his particular narrative, and though their object, too, is to teach ethics, nevertheless being the most significant parts of the narratives as they follow each other in chronological sequence, they can not but prove of considerable value as aids to historical study.

By far the most comprehensive graded course for the study of the history of Israel in Bible times is that of the Bible Study Union. Beginning with coloring cards illustrative of some Bible story for the use of children not yet able to read, it gradually advances to a text-book on Bible history, which comes nearer being a real history than any other now used in our religious schools.

The history of Israel being essentially biographical, one should hardly expect a biographical series of lessons running parallel with the historical series throughout the entire course. For each grade from the lowest to the highest—which for our purpose is the “Sixth Grade”—we have one set of lessons in Biblical biography and another in history. To be sure there can be no radical distinction between them. The only difference is that whereas in the biographical series everything centers about the great historic figure, in the historical series, the historic event stands out more prominently. The moral worth or worthlessness of an act depending on the character of the actor, and besides, it being much easier to estimate the deeds of individuals than a whole people, it is quite natural that in the biographical more attention should be given to the moral and religious phase of the subject than in the historical series. The two series are intended not as alternatives, but as complements of each other.

The lessons consist of four courses: The Children’s Course, the Boys’ and Girls’ Course, the Young People’s Course, each of which is divided into two grades, and an Adult Course, having only one grade. For our purpose we need but consider the first three, together furnishing the material of instruction for a period of six years.

In the Children’s Course, the First Grade, known as the “Primary Lessons and Cards,” is intended for children not yet of reading age. On the one side of the card is an outline of some object or person connected with the Bible story. The coloring of this card on the part of the child is to serve the twofold purpose of stimulating interest and aiding the memory. The

story itself is briefly told on the other side of the card. First and foremost is the Biblical reference which mothers are requested to read to the child. Then follow the Lesson Story and a number of questions. Lastly, there is a Primary Golden Text which, though related to the story, is seldom taken from it, but from any part of the Old or New Testament. As already noted, there is a biographical series alongside of the historical. Thus, in addition to the "Story Lessons" cards, there are also the "Bible Truths and Story" cards, this being the most elementary grade in the biographical series. The biographical series cards cover a large variety of topics, such as Obedience, Generosity, etc., drawn from the lives of the Biblical heroes. As soon as the child is able to read, it enters the second grade, and its text-book is the "Primary Monthly," which contains a story for each week. The "Story Lessons," being of the historical series, begin with Creation and end with Ezra, while the "Bible Truths and Stories," being of the biographical series, begin with Abraham and also end with Ezra.

The Boys' and Girls' Course comprises the Third and Fourth grades, intended for children between the ages of nine and ten and eleven and twelve years respectively. The names of the lessons for both grades are the same, only that in the fourth grade there is an additional designation of the "Junior Monthly." In this course we have "The Old Testament Stories" in the historical, and "Heroes of Israel" in the biographical series.

The Young People's Course is prepared for children between thirteen and fifteen years of age. The text-book of the Fifth Grade is specifically known as "The Intermediate Quarterly," while that of the Sixth is "The Progressive Quarterly." The titles common to both are "Old Testament History" in the historical, and "Patriarchs, Kings and Prophets" in the biographical series. In this course the history extends as far as the reign of Herod.

Besides these text-books for the pupil, each course has two teachers' manuals, one for each series. These are highly val-

uable, not only for their splendid suggestions as to how to present the lessons, but also for the copious notes they contain.

The object in giving the titles of the lessons in the various grades and courses must be evident to one who scans them. They help to give one an idea of the progressive treatment of the Biblical material. Already in the most elementary grade all the stories of the Bible are given, but with each succeeding grade they receive an ever-increasing organization and enrichment.

In the Children's Course the story is a portrayal of a single concrete event, becoming less detailed and more complete in the Boys' and Girls' Course, while in the Young People's Course the appeal is made not so much to the imagination as the intellect of the reader. This progressive development of the story into history is so skillfully done that it is difficult to say where the one ends and the other begins. Yet a comparative study of these courses will reveal that such a difference does exist. For instance, take the Fourth Grade in the Historical Series, which is the last of "The Old Testament Stories," and the crossing of the Jordan by Joshua, is related exactly as it is given in Joshua 3, 7-17, while the account of the same event in the Fifth Grade of the Historical Series, which is first Old Testament History, is given thus: "Now the Lord gave another proof of his power by making a way for them through the Jordan. The description of the drying up of the Jordan suggests that the event was due to a landslide above, which acted as a temporary dam. The place was probably near where the Jabbok enters the Jordan, nineteen miles in a straight line above Jericho. It is reported that a landslide of this kind took place there on December 8, A. D. 1267, which completely dammed up the river for several hours." Now, whether this account of Joshua crossing the Jordan is true or not is not the question. What is noteworthy, however, is that the writer here, as elsewhere, has shown a clear comprehension of the difference in the treatment of the same material when used in a story and history. As long as it is a story, it should possess

all the charm of the wonderful, so fascinating and so real to the child of the story and hero age. But anything that is accorded a place in history must be so presented as to do no violence to the child's historic sense.

The Bible Study Union Lessons are intended not to take the place of, but stimulate study in the Bible itself. Without constant reference to the Bible, even the most advanced grade of lessons will give one a rather incomplete knowledge of Israel's history in Bible times. Thus, for example, in the period of the Judges Deborah, Gideon, and Jephtha are the only ones mentioned in the lessons, though, of course, all of them are covered in the "Biblical Reference." Whether this constant reference to the Bible indispensable for a full knowledge of the subject, is an unqualified advantage, is difficult to say. There is no doubt about the helpfulness of a first-hand knowledge of the Bible to the clear understanding of the genius of Israel; and older children should by all means be urged to become thoroughly familiar with it. In the case of the young child, however, such a work may prove a strain on its power of concentration and create a distaste for the study altogether.

Thoroughly pedagogical as the lessons are in principle, they nevertheless show a woeful lack of appreciation of what constitutes a well-written story for young children. Simplicity of language and structure are not the only characteristics of a good story for young children. It must be imaginative and realistic, full of color and action. Wanting this power of appeal, all the wealth of illustrative material such as pictures and the "something to do" page these lessons contain, will not compensate for the shortcomings of the story. The novel feature of coloring the outline of an object often having no connection whatever with the story, appears to be quite artificial. While it may be a good lesson in drawing, it will hardly stimulate interest in the story. Surely the coloring of an elephant will not aid the child in learning the Creation story. Nor will the coloring of a camel show that Abraham was the "Friend of

God," even though it be the very camel upon which Abraham rode.

What the child wants is that the story itself be artistic. Having no special excellence and written from a Christian standpoint, there is no particular reason for using these stories in Jewish religious schools.

Beginning with the Third Grade there is a decidedly more successful adaptation to the progressive mental unfolding of the child. However, it is only in the Sixth Grade that the lessons possess exceptionally great merit. Both in the "Old Testament History" and the "Patriarchs, Kings and Prophets" we have the combined results of important researches in Bible lands and the Biblical material presented in a historical spirit. And even if occasionally we do find a miracle recorded it is never given such a prominence as to destroy the impression that here we have a history and not a congeries of incredible tales. These books come nearer being a history of Israel in Bible times than any other now used in our religious schools.

So much the keener the disappointment to find that owing to a few Christological expressions, their use in a Jewish religious school is impossible. "Abraham's call," we are told, "marks the beginning of the Messianic promises which were realized in the work of Christ, the Saviour of the world." In the lesson, "The Covenant of Sinai," the author asks: "How does the revelation from Mount Sinai compare with the revelation from Mount Zion?" And the answer is (Hebrews 12: 18-24)—of course not highly flattering to the former. The Smitten Rock is made the type of Christ (First Cor. 10: 4); and the Brazen Serpent is the type of the Son of God (John 3: 14-15)—both having been lifted up. In the lesson, "Servant of Jehovah," we read "The object of the lesson—to show how Israel's experiences and the teachings of the prophets pointed to an ideal servant through whose obedience and self-sacrifice Jehovah's redemptive purpose for the world would be realized, and how this ideal was fulfilled in Jesus Christ."

It is obvious that however conspicuous its merits, a history

of Israel containing such sentiments is not serviceable in a Jewish religious school. Whether the excision of these Christological passages would be regarded as a sufficient conversion to admit them into the household of Israel is questionable. In the majority of Bible histories written by non-Jewish authors, it is not the letter, but the spirit that killeth.

In reviewing the historical text-books written by Jewish authors occupying a privileged place in our religious schools one finds that, with the rarest exception, the writers had no clear idea as to whether it was a Bible story-book or a Bible history, that they purposed to write. Hence, they can hardly be classified, since they will admit of no scientific principle of division. All we can do is, for the sake of convenience, group them according to the period of history as recorded in the Bible, they respectively cover. Following this course we find that they are separable into three groups:

(A) Those books covering the period from Creation to the death of Moses.

(B) Those extending from the Creation to the establishment of the Kingdom.

(C) Those beginning with Creation and ending with the Restoration under Ezra and Nehemiah.

Group "A" comprises "Bible Stories"—Annie Jonas Moses; "Bible Lessons for School and Home"—Dr. Herman Baar; "Tales and Teachings from the Pentateuch"—Mrs. Morris Joseph and Re. Henry.

Group "B" comprises "The Historical Series of the Leaflets" for the use of religious schools—Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Group "C" comprises "The Child's First Bible"—F. de Sola Mendes; "A Primary Bible History"—Ben Jacob; "A Manual of Scripture History"—Louis B. Abrahams; "Biblical History for School and Home"—Julius Katzenberg; "Biblical History in Biblical Language"—Dr. Solomon Deutsch; "The People of the Book"—M. H. Harris.

A.

"Bible Stories," by Annie Jonas Moses, is one of the best books of its kind, and but for her desire to omit as little as possible of the Biblical narrative, thus relating things that can not possibly appeal to the child of the story and hero age, she might have given us a truly splendid booklet. Her style is simple and entertaining. Wherever Biblical language adds force to the story, she gives the original. Her failure to do so in the Ten Commandments is doubtless due to her regard for the inability of the young reader to grasp them in their original language. Instead, however, she tells them in a manner which preserves the spirit, if not the letter, of the Bible.

Unlike all the other authors of similar productions, she does not often sermonize, either in the middle or at the end of the story, but in a rather skillful manner, weaves the moral into the story. Nor does she attempt to explain the miracles she relates. And we can not be too thankful to her for that, for a story that is told to a child of the story age should be miraculous, or its appeal to the child will be very weak. Only once does she deviate from this commendable course, and that is when she says, "Lot's wife was turned into a pillar of salt because the salt sea covered her." The Doré pictures illustrating these stories, adds greatly to their value.

Baar's "Bible Lessons for School and Home," though also written in a fairly simple style, and even more richly illustrated, will not appeal to the young child. Not that the author has not taken pains to make them so. On the contrary, he has tried very hard, in fact, too hard. He made his stories very clumsy, and decidedly prosaic. The rational element predominates almost to the exclusion of the imaginative. The unity of the story is broken by reflections often very far fetched. In his endeavor to make everything clear, the writer has not unfrequently succeeded in doing the very opposite. Thus, for instance, after relating the story of Moses receiving the tokens

by which the Israelites would believe him to be God's messenger, he says: "Faith in a good work is like a staff which supports in every condition of life, if, however, we throw this staff on the ground and use it only for unholy and unbecoming purposes it often changes into a serpent and poisons the welfare of men and nations. Faith accompanied by good deeds, is like a hand doing acts of charity, but if such a hand rests idly in our bosom or in our lap, it not seldom changes faith into cold inactivity or indifference." Now, from a homiletical standpoint this may be very good, but if it is to serve as an explanation of the wonders Moses performed, then it is rather gratuitous since this juggling of words in the hands of the writer is more miraculous by far than the juggling of the rod in the hands of Moses.

The story, "Noah and the Flood," is introduced as follows: "The number of human beings was rapidly growing on the earth, and with their increase they became more sinful and wicked. How could it have been otherwise? we may ask. There were no schools, no teachings, neither religious impressions nor bright personal examples set before the eyes of the young." If that was really the case, then why should God have destroyed those innocent victims of untoward conditions for which they were not responsible? the child will naturally ask. What God should have commanded Noah to do was to build schools to save others, and not an ark to save himself. Now, there was no occasion for that reflection. It simply killed the moral effect of the story.

As another example of the detriment resulting from his Midrashic comments we may cite the story, "God's promise to Abram." God had just told Abram that his descendants will be as numerous as the stars in the heaven. The little child is still gazing in rapt admiration at the countless hosts of light above when he is suddenly aroused by the sound of these ill-starred words, "The stars pointed to by God to Abram are like our people's mission on earth. Like stars dimly shining, and then glittering and brightening up the sky and again being

darkened by sweeping clouds, so Israel's fate in the world's history is in some measure foretold." What a prosaic ending of a most dramatic situation and what a fearful perversion of the real intent of the story!

Throughout the entire book one is impressed more with the ingeniousness than the ingenuousness of the author. Whatever value therefore may attach to this book for the moral and ethical lessons it contains, as a story-book for children of the story age, it is worthless. For what was once said of the Kingdom of God, we may well say of the Kingdom of Fancy: "Whosoever does not receive it as a little child, he shall in no-wise enter therein."

"The Tales and Teachings," by Mrs. Morris Joseph, was written primarily for religious, or to be more exact, theological instruction. The object of the book, says the author, is "to strengthen the conviction that God is perfect." She expresses the hope that "The Tales and Teachings may be useful to them (young friends) by imbuing them with reverence and affection for the Bible, with love and obedience for Him whose Word it contains, and with respect for the Religion it teaches, and the Race whose story it tells." Hence, according to the author's own statement, the story is only one of the objects and a minor one at that. That she did not use the story as an end in itself, is shown by her disregard of both the age and the power of understanding on the part of her young reader. Whatever merit the story might have possessed and frequently does possess, for she is not a bad story teller, is completely overshadowed by the long theological disquisition that follows. Instead of confining herself to the complete, simple and particular, she takes special delight in dwelling on the abstract and philosophical. Thus, for instance, after relating the story of Creation, she tells the child all about the Incorporeality of God, the Immortality of the Soul, and incidentally dwells on the blessedness of such a faith. One might imagine that for one lesson this is enough theology for a child not yet ten years of age, and that she would now proceed to the next story, but

such is not the case. She simply paused to take a long breath—that alone will account for the long hiatus between what precedes and what follows as shown in the book. When she resumes it is to teach the doctrine of Free-Will. Then for fear lest the child become entirely too self-reliant, she admonishes him to “pray constantly to our Heavenly Father that our feet may be kept in the right path. And if we pray with all our hearts, He will assuredly hear us, and victory will crown our fight with evil.”

In the comment on the story of the Tower of Babel she says, “It is clear that in attempting to carry out their idea of living together always, the people were trying to frustrate the wise and good purposes of God. As read in the first chapter of Genesis it was His will that the whole world should be inhabited and cultivated. Therefore, it was necessary that men should not be one community, living in one huge city, but should be dispersed over the face of the globe.” Inasmuch as the builders of the Tower of Babel greatly accelerated this dispersion, there ought to be erected a monument, sky-high, to those martyrs to the cause of civilization.

If one were to write the curiosities in the Bible, taking the “The Tales and Teachings” as his source, he would note not merely the significant fact already pointed out in the “Text-Book of Religion and Ethics” that Rebecca was the only woman in the Bible who wore a veil, but that she was also the first coquette in the Bible; that Jacob was the first man cook in the Bible, and that no artificial light could penetrate the darkness which enveloped Egypt, “for doubtless the Egyptians possessed lamps.”

Nevertheless, though the Tales possess very few characteristics of good stories for young children, the Teachings expository of the Jewish religion, written as they are in a convincing style, and with a deep, religious spirit, are admirably suited as a religious guide for older children. That having been the author’s chief aim in writing this book, her labor has not been in vain.

B.

The "Leaflets for the use of Religious Schools" on Biblical History, published by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, are divided into three series, the first two covering respectively the periods from the Creation to the death of Joseph and from the birth to the death of Moses, consist of twenty leaflets each; while the third, beginning with Joshua assuming leadership, and ending with the death of Samuel, consists of eighteen leaflets.

The writer of these leaflets had an exceptional opportunity to render a signal service to the cause of Jewish religious education. Written under the auspices of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, these leaflets might have become the medium of instruction at least in the schools of those congregations belonging to the Union and thereby have supplied an element of unity and uniformity so sadly needed in our system of religious education. However, even if they should be so enlarged as to cover the entire period of Jewish History, they would hardly be given such preeminence, nor are they entitled thereto. There is no clearly recognized distinction between history stories and history proper. At one time one is inclined to believe that here we have stories for the child of the story age. For instance, when one reads that Moses was not permitted to enter the promised land because instead of speaking to, he smote the Rock, or that Samson's strength returned with the restoration of his hair, he will naturally conclude that these are stories. Then again, when one finds such an introduction to a story as "The people who believed these things were not nearly so wise as we are," the opposite conclusion forces itself upon the reader. For who ever heard a story or a fairy tale opening in this manner? A real story usually begins with "Once upon a time," and the child hearing or reading that story will believe it to be true, no matter how remote it may be from its own experience, for the simple reason

that it happened in those far-off days when men were grander and wiser, because that was the heroic age. Similarly, when we read, "God's deliverance of Israel through Moses is always spoken of as a wonderful thing, my dear children, and so it was. But all the wonders did not happen at that time. There are wonders taking place every day and around you. Our God works wonders all the time. Have you ever noticed the beautiful sunsets? . . .," we can not but feel that these words were intended for a lot of sceptics and not the simple faith of the child-like heart. But the best, because a typical example, of this lack of definiteness of aim upon the part of the writer, will be found in leaflets fifteen and sixteen of Series 1, "Joseph in Prison" and "Pharaoh's Dream." In the former we read: "From this incident in the life of Joseph we have again learned how much importance the people in those days placed in dreams and their explanations. They were always trying to find out their meaning. But later the people were taught to do good while awake, and not to worry foolishly as to what dreams might mean. The great Jewish teachers advise the people not to pay attention to or place reliance in dreams." On the other hand, in the latter without dissent or comment we are given Joseph's answer to Pharaoh: "The dream of Pharaoh is one. What God is going to do he has told to Pharaoh." Now one should like to know in which of these leaflets is found the true significance of dreams. Are dreams so meaningless that they are unworthy of notice on the part of intelligent men, or are they so portentous that God himself does not disdain to interpret them? Well, as a matter of fact, both conceptions are true. The former in history, the latter in story. But when put side by side as parts of the same narrative, they naturally contradict each other.

But in spite of this vacillating state, the historical spirit is everywhere struggling for expression. Where this becomes articulate, the writer is at his best. In style also there is a marked advance in those leaflets that are treated as history over those that are merely stories. In the latter the author

never fails to sermonize, thereby robbing the story of its natural beauty.

C.

The books considered under this head embrace in outline or detail the entire Biblical narrative. Some confine themselves almost exclusively to those incidents and episodes that are striking and startling, barely mentioning cold facts be their historical importance ever so great. These, if useful at all, must be so for younger children. On the other hand, those which accord to all of the Biblical material equal consideration may serve equally well for history and story, depending entirely on the treatment of the subject matter.

To the former class belongs the "The Child's First Bible," by F. de Sola Mendes. Here only the most startling and fanciful stories are given. Whatever is devoid of strangeness is either completely ignored or dismissed with a word. Thus out of the twenty chapters that the book comprises, one is given to the account of the Ten Plagues, while only a single word to the Ten Commandments. To Daniel also he devotes a whole chapter, while of the Prophets in Israel, whose careers were not spectacular like that of Elijah, Isaiah alone is given, and that only incidentally. Of the Judges, Samson is the favorite; and but for the author's gallantry, Deborah would not receive even honorary mention.

Evidently, the "Child's First Bible" is a storybook, and as such it is a dismal failure. Despite the fact that it is written mainly in words of one and two syllables, it is deficient even in adaptation of language. "Circumcision," "Idolatrous," "Prevailed," "Conjurers" are not a part of a young child's ordinary vocabulary. Besides, the book contains altogether too many proper names. Every other element of a good story for children is conspicuously absent. These facts compel the statement that "The Child's First Bible" should be the very last

to be placed in the hands of the young child, for fear lest being the first it might be the last.

Somewhat more interesting to the young child will prove the "Primary Bible History," by Ben Jacob. Although here more attention is given to strictly historical events and individuals, this is still only a storybook. Here, too, Samson occupies the foremost place among the Judges. Elijah, Elisha and Jonah are singled out from among the prophets. Of all the kings after the division of the Kingdom, Ahab alone is given considerable prominence and that because it helps to bring out into greater relief the towering personality of Elijah.

Owing to a somewhat greater richness of material and little more movement and dramatic force, due largely to the freer use of direct discourse, the "Primary Bible History" is much better than the "The Child's First Bible," but nevertheless it does not rank very high as a story-book; while as a history it will find it exceedingly difficult to establish its claim.

Yet the book is not devoid of some originality. In the story of Noah we read: "But God, who is so good and kind, was unwilling to destroy the wicked people and would rather have them repent. He therefore told Noah to build a ship, called the ark, and tell the people for what purpose the ark was being built, and that if they would become better, they would not be destroyed. . . . For one hundred and twenty years did Noah warn the people to repent, but it was in vain; for they only laughed at him." What a long laugh they had! Of Moses he says, "Moses was such a beautiful boy that his mother could not bear to have him thrown into the river." What a blessing that Moses was beautiful! Of all the miracles, that of Jonah being swallowed by the fish alone is omitted. Surely not because of its impossibility, but no doubt because it would have been somewhat uncomfortable.

A more pretentious work is "A Manual of Scripture History," by Louis B. Abraham. Without any reflections or explanations of his own, he presents in fairly Biblical language the entire Scripture narrative. At first glance one might be in-

clined to regard this as a rather serviceable text-book. Upon closer examination, however, it is found that even without insisting on historical treatment of anything that passes as history, this book is very inadequate.

If the History of Israel be anything, it is the history of its great men. A History of Israel with the prophets omitted can be of very little worth. Without them we can get no correct idea of the History of Israel. They were not merely religious leaders, but shrewd politicians, patriotic statesmen, and great social reformers. Yet Abraham finds space for even the brazen serpent, but has no standing room for the grandest characters in Jewish, as well as universal history. It is needless to say that at least for the period when the prophets lived, his Manual is useless.

Whatever value this book has lies altogether in parts three and four, from the death of Moses to the division of the Kingdom. He does not show here a truer historical temper than in any other part of his book, but he displays a good sense of proportion in the use of his material, and shows the greatest regard for geography, a very essential consideration in that particular period, namely, the period of the Conquest.

From a literary standpoint, the book will find very few admirers. Though the language is largely Biblical, and therefore can not be entirely prosaic, there is no progressive heightening of interest, no dramatic advance or movement. It is all on a dead level, and for that reason can not produce a desire on the part of the child to find out what comes next.

Katzenberg's "Biblical History" is divided into five parts, each of which is intended for one year's study. For the first year we have from Creation to the death of Joseph; for the second year from the birth to the death of Moses; for the third year, from the period of Joshua and the Judges; for the fourth year, we have the United Kingdom; and for the fifth year, from the division of the Kingdom to Ezra.

This gradation of Biblical history is bad in principle and worse in execution. The stories between the Creation and the

death of Joseph may be most appropriate for the child in the first grade, though even that is by no means certain. But surely there is more power of appeal in the story of Samson or Elijah for the child of the second grade than "The Service in the Sanctuary" or the settlement of Reuben, Gad, and half of the tribe of Manasseh. And as for the method employed to bring about an adaptation in these stories to the young reader, by adding moral lessons, this too argues a lack of pedagogical insight. How utterly devoid his appreciation of child intelligence is; can best be shown by quoting the moral lessons in his very first story:

"God is the Creator of the world. His will and word brought forth everything. He is omnipotent, that is, the Almighty. He can do whatever he pleases.

"By the word of the Eternal were the heavens made, and by the breath of His mouth all their host." Ps. xxxiii, 6.

Everything has a beginning; God is without beginning; He is uncreated; He was, He is, and He will ever be. He is eternal, i. e., everlasting.

"I am the first and I am the last, and beside Me there is no God." Isa., xlv, 6.

God is allwise. The various objects of the universe were called into existence in the best order and for the best purpose.

"How manifold are Thy works, O Eternal! In wisdom hast Thou made them all; the earth is full of Thy riches." Ps. civ, 24.

These Moral Lessons designed to simplify (?) the stories disappear in the third period, and observations equally well adapted to the understanding of the child take their place. While with the beginning of the fourth part, each story is followed by Bible verses, never taken from the body of the story.

The latter part of the book is somewhat more suitable to the child for whom it is written. Even here, however, the language is considerably above the comprehension of the average child. The prophets receive as little attention in this book

as they do in the former. There is, therefore, very little ground on which to commend its use as a text-book.

"Deutsch's Biblical History in Biblical Language" is a continuous narrative from the Creation to Malachi (the latter being dated 420 B. C.), with an appended synopsis of Job and Koheleth, which, though not an integral part of the narrative, nevertheless coming within the province of Biblical literature, are not out of place in Bible history. In the composition of this book the author has done three things that are noteworthy. In the first place, he has retained not merely the Biblical language, but also the structure; only here and there substituting words that would add to the simplicity of the story. He also emphasizes the influence of the Prophets as a dynamic force in the age in which they lived and labored, and never fails to quote such portions of their writings as will best reveal their spirit. And, lastly, wherever the Bible contains two versions of the same event, he combines them into a single account.

In sacrificing as little as possible of the forceful style of the Biblical original, he has earned the thanks of all those who appreciate the difference between the grandeur of the story as told by those masters in the art of story telling and the hackneyed style of many a story-teller of these latter days. Even a greater service has he rendered us by assigning the prophets their legitimate place in Jewish History. But when instead of confining himself to one of two versions descriptive of the same event he preferred to combine the two, he undertook an impossible task, and failure was a foregone conclusion. Take, for instance, the two versions of David's introduction to Saul. In one David is presented as a man of war. "Behold!" says one of the servants to Saul, "I have seen a son of Jesse, the Bethlehemite, that is skillful in playing, and a mighty man of valor and a man of war and prudent in speech and a comely person; and Jehovah is with him." (I Sam., 16-18.) In the other account, however, he is a shepherd boy and an inexperienced youth. (I Sam., 17, 33.) Our author reconciles

these two accounts by making the former sentence read as follows: "Behold, I have seen a son of Jesse, the Bethlehemite, who is skillful in playing the harp and in the singing of hymns, and is in other respects deserving of great regard." While in this instance the omission, though not critical, is after all not so very serious, such is not the case in other similar attempts. When the author does not hesitate to combine two passages expressing entirely opposite tendencies such as in the two versions of the election of Saul, or in the Book of Kings and Chronicles, then he certainly introduces an element of confusion even greater than that of the Biblical original.

As for its use as a text-book for the History of Israel in Bible times, that will depend entirely upon our attitude to the Bible itself, inasmuch as it is preeminently an abridged Bible. If we regard all of the Biblical narrative as objectively true, then this book has much in its favor; but if any part of the Bible is true only subjectively, then not showing any discrimination between the two, it can be of little practical value.

"The People of the Book," by M. H. Harris, is a work of three volumes subdivided into two, three and four books respectively. These are intended to cover a period of study of several years, and hence ought to show progressive treatment. Nor is there any doubt that the author actually believed that this had been accomplished. To what extent that is true can be best shown by internal evidence. In the story of Noah we read, "God blessed Noah and gave him seven rules of right living, the chief one was that man might kill cattle for food, and that no human being dare take the life of another." But surely this is not a Biblical story. It is found in Sanhedrin, 56b, and the author might have informed us to that effect. In the story of the Tower of Babel we read: "But I am sorry to say in the middle of the work they began to quarrel. Instead of using their tools to build, they began throwing them at each other. Of course, they could not very well get on with their building after that, so that at last they had to give up this foolish plan in despair. Babel means confusion. Con-

flict always brings confusion, separation or ruin. . . .” What a pity that they began “throwing their tools at each other!” If they had only used their tools to build, then there would have been no confusion, separation and ruin, and, as a result, instead of confusion, sky-scraper would now be the synonym of Babel. The life of Abraham reads more like a Sura out of the Koran than the Biblical narrative. The trial of Abraham, instead of being a test of faith so simple and sublime, is “sicklied o’er with a pale cast of thought.” And then to cap the climax there follows this note: “While the story has been made as *simple as the subject matter permitted*, it may still be too advanced for some of the scholars. In that case it should be passed by.” As described by the writer, it should be passed by, by all means.

Surely, if this volume had been intended for children of the story age, the stories would have received different treatment and nothing that is fanciful would have been eliminated. If, on the other hand, it was to have been a history, then why did it not deal exclusively with materials having historical veracity and in a strictly historical spirit? As it is, the whole work possesses a mythico-historical appearance. After telling us in all seriousness that Samson’s strength lay in his hair, the author says in the notes “Compare Hercules with Samson.” Now, the question arises, does the author mean that Samson’s feats are as historical as the labors of Hercules, or that Hercules’ strength, too, lay in his hair? Of the ark of God taken from Shilo in the war with the Philistines the author says: “What shall we say of those foolish people who supposed that a wooden box could save them from their enemies. . . . It was no more than any other chest in which scrolls or sacred treasures are kept.” But in the very next paragraph we read: “The Philistines, in great triumph, took the ark to one of their cities, Ashdod, on the coast and set it in front of Dagon, their idol. But everything seemed to go wrong with them now, and at last they were glad to get rid of it.” Evidently there was something to that wooden box. Of the miracles which Elijah per-

formed there is no mention except, after giving the prayer of Elijah that Jehovah might hear him, the historian laconically remarks, "His prayer was heard; the sacrifice was accepted." Surely, that is not fair to Elijah, nor very historical! There was no reason why he should not have related the contest between Elijah and the priests of Baal exactly as it is given in the Bible, simply adding that this legend is the best illustration of the grandeur of this champion of true religion.

Yet it were unfair to dismiss this scholarly work with simply pointing out the shortcomings thereof. In spite of them, the third volume is by far the best text-book on that period of Israel's history. Everywhere it shows the utmost regard for time and space relations. Whatever of contemporary history had the remotest bearing on Israel's political and religious life, is duly recognized. Nor are the notes following each lesson to be underestimated. The limitations of this work are due to the fact that the author has attempted the impossible, namely, to change the supernatural into natural. Now, for the child of faith, nothing is supernatural since, in the words of Dr. Ellis, "Myth and orthodoxy are in rapport with childhood." But for the child of maturer years, it will always remain supernatural. History, being the study of man acting under environment, says, "The Heavens are of Heavens of the Lord, but the earth hath He given to the children of men."

Rabbi Franklin—Mr. Chairman, I feel that I have been somewhat more fortunate than most of the members of the Conference in that it was my privilege, however hurriedly, to glance over the entire paper, of which Rabbi Kornfeld presented only the very briefest resume this morning. In reading in full his reviews of Bible histories now in use, I thanked God that whatever sins I have committed in my life, I have never attempted to write a Bible history. It must be conceded that most of the books we have, if not all of them, seem to be inadequate to the needs of the child and the Jewish religious school. If we were to put our finger on the fundamental cause of their failure, it would be that these books have, for the

greater part, been written by preachers and not by professional teachers. The preacher is, of course, a teacher, but in a sense he is a teacher of adults and not so much a teacher of children. Moreover, the preacher is under the obsession of his vocation. Every time a preacher opens his mouth he preaches a sermon. Children do not wish to be sermonized to, but they wish to be interested and inspired. I fully agree with the thought brought out in another connection this morning, that the best, if not the only, way to teach ethics is the indirect method—that it should be taught through history. But in order to teach ethics and morals and standards of conduct through history, it is not necessary, as some think, to tack your moral to the story and say, "This is the moral of the story." That is what has been practically done in one form or another in all the Jewish Bible histories we have. The fact of the matter is, gentlemen, all education is moral or it is not education. Whether you deal with geography, arithmetic, manual training, or anything else, you must make it moral per se, or yours is not good teaching. To illustrate: What is the real value of sloyd training in your schools? Is it that the boy may be able to turn out a desk or a chair? No. It is in its moral suggestions. You may teach a child that one and one make two, but for all that, that one and one make two is to the child an abstract theory, which needs to be interpreted by concrete illustration. But if you give the child pieces of wood to form into a door and tell that child that these pieces must be absolutely plumb or they won't fit into the framework, you give him a concrete illustration that goes home to him and forces the truth upon him. Just as the piece will not fit the door if out of plumb, so the life out of plumb will not fit into the framework of society. That is the point which must always be emphasized. Your text-book must be written with the moral in the story itself.

Another thing that should be mentioned in connection with the paper that has been read is this: It is to my mind very undesirable that the altogether artificial division of Bible

stories into those of the hero age, the story age, etc., should be insisted upon. While I do not question that there are certain kinds of stories that appeal more than others to children at certain ages, I do hold that this theory has been overdone to a very great extent with the result that where it has been introduced, the continuity of the Bible story has been altogether broken, and as a consequence the child taught by this method has no real appreciation of the continuous development of Jewish life and character as it is reflected in the pages of the Bible. As a matter of fact, child psychology has become in the hands of some of our colleagues, a much suffering term. I need not tell you that the theory, especially exploited by Stanley Hall, and which in its day was hailed as a wonderful discovery, that the race and the child go through exactly the same stages of development, has been long since exploded, and with it this artificial division of which I speak has also fallen to the ground.

Let us then present the stories of the Bible to the child, that are of interest at the various periods, but let us be careful not to put that theory on a pedestal and then work it to death. We are also told to simplify the story for the child, but let us be warned not to simplify too much, for we must maintain the dignity of the child while catering to the needs of its unfolding intellect.

H

A REVIEW OF COURSES OF STUDY AND METHODS
IN USE IN JEWISH SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.

RABBI GEORGE SOLOMON, SAVANNAH, GA.

Though an assignment coming in the very midst of the holiday season and only five weeks before the meeting of the Conference, and inability to get reports from more than seventy schools, must, of necessity, make this review meager and unsatisfactory, still several years of close study of the question gives one more to say than the twenty minute limit of this paper would permit. Without any introduction, then, I will go at once to the subject.

An analysis of the reports from seventy schools shows that the average school session consists of one hour and a half per week. The longest term shown is thirty-eight weeks, but allowing for holidays and interruptions, the average term does not extend over thirty weeks. The courses, though very differently arranged and named in the various schools, include Jewish history, Judaism and Hebrew. In almost every instance there is a marked effort to give, either by teaching or exemplification, a knowledge of Jewish customs whether embodied in the holiday or special celebrations. While quite a few do not seem to go beyond Biblical history, a number endeavor to cover the entire field of Jewish history, even to the inclusion of a special course in New Testament, in one instance, and a study of Biblical criticism, reform and orthodoxy and Jewish literature, as indicated in two other cases. Thirty-three schools include Hebrew. Perhaps others have it in the curriculum, but their reports are silent concerning it. Thirty-one have children's services, and thirty begin with a kindergarten or primary preparatory class for children unable to read. Only eight have mentioned the matter of prizes, four favoring, and four object-

ing to the idea. No less than twenty different text-books are in use, one school using as many as five. Nine use the Bible alone as text-book, up to the point where post-Biblical history is studied, though ten others who report a "conversational" method leave me to infer that they also use the Bible as text-book, though they do not definitely specify. In the great majority of cases the Bible is more or less used in the higher classes, the conclusion seeming to be that the Bible would be pretty generally preferred, if only there were some proper system and arrangement providing for its use. Many schools have libraries, and clubs of different character, holiday entertainments, lantern exhibitions and the like. The age of admission varies from five to seven, according to the facilities of kindergarten or primary instruction. The general agreement for entering the school proper seeming to be nine years. The average for the entry into the confirmation class is fourteen. Only three schools seem to consider the needs of the adolescent, and they arrange to keep the pupils to the age of eighteen. The average vacation period extends from three to four months. In only one case have I found any attempt to bridge over this hiatus. Manifestly some plan for vacation extension work or study should be arranged for.

While this statistical statement is rather vague and unsatisfactory, it is not nearly so much so, as the reports on which it is based. It would take at least six months of persistent effort to get anything like complete returns. Incomplete though they are, yet from them, as from the opinions expressed by the seventy Rabbis, are indicated several considerations which may well serve as a basis for our action in the matter of the Sunday-School.

The two most serious defects of the entire system or lack of it, expressed in varying degrees of doleful, emphatic protest, by many, and implied by well nigh every Rabbi of the seventy, are lack of properly trained teachers and dearth of adequate text-books. Doubtless all of us are only too sadly aware of these

troubles. A study of the reports has led me to the following conclusions:

1. Admitting that everything said to their detriment be true, the Jewish Sunday-School teachers are a band of much-tried martyrs. They are woefully unfitted for their task, but as a matter of fact practically nothing has ever been done to qualify them for it. The statements of the heads of the schools who made their reports, indicates most clearly that we are at sea ourselves, and it is high time to ask and answer the questions: (a) What is the purpose of the Jewish Sunday-School? (b) What must be the nature of the school? (c) What have we on hand in the way of material and facilities to make it what it should be? Manifestly there can be but one answer to the question of its purpose, namely, to inculcate a thorough knowledge of the essentials of Jewish history and Judaism. This self-evident fundamental being granted, it follows that in its nature, the Jewish Sunday-School can not be, what it has so largely been made to resemble, either the Christian Sunday-School or the public school. True, as we all know, it is a comparatively recent institution, and while chronologically the successor of the Cheder, in the turmoil resulting from the attempt to readjust Jewish life as well as worship to the newer environment, there has not been time to develop the religious school properly. As it is, many of the books now employed are those written for the Christian Sunday-School, and the head of one of these houses, writes me that he has many demands from Jewish schools. As the content and purpose and character of our religious activities is so radically different from that of our neighbors, our religious school must have its own individuality. No book or method, deliberately intended to further the purposes of one religion, can be properly fitted to serve the ends of another faith. Neither can our schools be conducted on the public school principle. As we saw that the average time of instruction amounts to only forty-five hours a year, it needs no further argument to point out the futility of adopting the methods of the public school. If, for example,

monthly tests are provided for, as a number of schools report, it means that at least eight such tests are given, taking up just so many of the sessions, and bringing the hours of instruction for the year down to thirty-three instead of forty-five. Let us remember, too, that from this total must be deducted the time taken up in opening and closing exercises, and we can not fail to appreciate how little the methods and procedure for schools whose sessions cover thirty-five weeks of thirty hours a week, can be applied to our religious school, whose entire session equals less than three percent of the time of the public school sessions. Organized, systematised charities are required to cope with the charity problems where the cases number hundreds; when they come singly, the old individual way of dealing with them is sufficient. The application is obvious. At best, we can only hope to produce certain impressions on the children. We can not seriously expect, with forty-five hours a year at our command, to undertake an elaborate system of instruction. The home and the synagogue are valuable adjuncts, and the children's service is a great help. As nearly half of those who reported have employed this, it might at least be worth a trial for the rest of us to test its value.

When we come to the consideration as to the materials and facilities at our disposal, we find that while there is at present only a forty-five-hour season to work with, we have the home, the synagogue, and more than these, the heritage of over thirty centuries, the spiritually historical Jewish consciousness, and this latter may be splendidly reinforced, as is done in some instances, by having a collection of Jewish objects and relics in the school, so that the children may see them and listen to their explanation.

Not only are many different books in use, but from numerous quarters comes the plaint that all have been successively tried, with poor results. Some say that they use their present textbooks because of the lack of anything better; some have cut the gordian knot, using none at all. With this condition confronting us, we may be justified in the conclusion that there

is not a single text-book adequately fitted for the needs of the modern Jewish religious school. And yet we are the "People of the Book." Why not use that book? We have very classic recollections of the evil resulting from the making of books without end. Though we must find it necessary to adopt new methods, we may profit by the experience of our ancestors. FOR THE TEACHING OF JEWISH HISTORY, FOR THE INCULCATING OF THE SPIRIT OF JUDAISM, THERE IS NOTHING THAT CAN COMPARE WITH THE BIBLE, THE SPLENDID PRODUCT OF JEWISH GENIUS. Unity is the very foundation stone of all Jewish thought. Educators are agreed that education, to be efficient, must be a co-ordination of all the faculties and powers. We do not need a catechism to teach doctrine, a manual for ethics, a text-book for history and still another for religion. Whatever the shade of our reform or orthodoxy, we can all agree that Judaism is inseparable from its history, its ethics and its doctrine. Therefore, the Bible is the ideal text-book for our use. Certainly not in its present form. We should have a school Bible. Balancing the content of Jewish knowledge we wish to impart, with the receptive powers of the varying stages of the child's development, we can arrange an edition of the Bible, bringing in the history and moral and religious teachings, in whatsoever order we deem best. Not an easy, but a feasible task. The Bible phraseology should remain unchanged, except to simplify large words. This for the child. Paralleling this we should have a companion volume for the use of the teacher, with notes, suggestions, and all necessary information. Parents also might find good use for this book. Thus might we solve the problem which seems the most serious, in the way of our religious schools. We would have at once a uniform system of lessons, and we could secure even for the smallest community, something like adequate teaching. The Rabbi might still continue, as many now do, to hold a teacher's meeting every week, but the teacher's manual would render the work far more effective. Various devices, in line with modern educational ideas might be added, such as

spaces for pictures, questions, etc., or blank leaves bound between the pages of the text.

With several quite efficient Hebrew courses at hand, each school may readily employ the ones best suiting its needs. After all, the most that can be hoped for within the school term is fair proficiency in reading, and as it is, very wisely, nearly every school uses the prayerbook for translation exercises. One strikingly original system for teaching Hebrew in the kindergarten classes has been devised by Rabbi Foster, and should be alluded to. His own explanation will be found in the appendix to this paper.

A review of the courses and methods in use suggests that the best plan would be a school arranged with a kindergarten, primary, intermediate, and confirmation and post confirmation department, and I might add that the longer the children are held the better it would be. There is no particular reason or justification for letting children go at the age of fifteen years with the idea that their religious education is complete.

In summarising I would emphasize that the crying need of our religious school is **A UNIFORM CURRICULUM AND A UNIFORM TEXT-BOOK. THE ONE IS USELESS WITHOUT THE OTHER.** Permit me to add that while attempts have been made before in this direction, though never by the Conference, nothing has resulted. Perhaps a fundamental error was the idea that the Rabbi is the proper and sole person fitted for this. To undertake this task and carry it out effectively, the trained teacher—he or she who comes in daily contact with the child, and knows its needs and capabilities—must be given a hand in the work. All our effort in this direction has thus far been too theoretical and abstract. Then, too, it has always been the “prominent” Rabbi, the head of a large metropolitan congregation, to whom has been entrusted the task. The very large schools are few, and the conditions in the large cities are exceptional. We must legislate for the average school, and for the average community, therefore to those familiar with these conditions must the arrangement be given over.

While we may all welcome the establishment of the teachers' schools, and heartily congratulate the communities so fortunate as to have them, we must remember that their main, if indeed, not their only good, will be in the places wherein they are located, and these institutions will not help to solve the universal problem. Teaching in the religious school has not become a profession, and the returns are scarcely great enough to justify anyone going away to study for three years to become equipped for the task. It might be within the province of this Conference to suggest that a correspondence course be established, and this would greatly help.

In connection with my "impressionist" theory of the method of religious teaching, I would suggest that the simple dramatization of the Bible stories, each to be merely one scene in itself, would with the services be a very effective method. If once a month one such story was presented by a different class in the school it would be a source of entertainment and instruction as well. This is very simple and easy, and can be fitted for the needs of the largest or smallest school. Such a series might be provided, or each Rabbi could very easily do it for himself.

To bring matters to a practical form, I would suggest that a board of twelve editors be appointed, not more than twenty-five percent of whom are to be from the large cities, who shall elaborate a complete course of instruction for the Jewish religious school, and in conjunction with this, outline a School Bible Teachers' Manual. This course to include instruction from the kindergarten period up to the confirmation class, covering all of Biblical and post Biblical history at least through the Talmudic period. Either as an appendix to the school Bible or in separate pamphlet form there should be a few well arranged prayers for different occasions and a summary of the calendar and holidays. There should be at least two or three sets of prayers to fit the children of different ages. Secondly, since we have no pictures which both historically and artistically illustrate Bible stories, that the Conference, either through this editorial board or

otherwise, take steps toward securing such pictures. Thirdly, that above mentioned board select an equal number of well known Jewish teachers to collaborate with them, as members of such board. Lastly, that this board enter into correspondence with the Jewish Chautauqua Society, the Council of Jewish Women, and any and every other Jewish organization which is doing or attempting to do work in this line.

There is no excuse for the multiplicity of effort which is wasting itself in so many Jewish organizations. If they do not antagonize, at least they overlap, duplicate and often interfere with each other. It is the natural province of the Rabbi to arrange and conduct Jewish religious education. These several organizations, of which the Rabbi is often a prominent member, are trying to further these aims, but unless effort is consolidated and unified, the lack of harmony often results in practical antagonism.

Had time permitted, I should have prepared an appendix, containing the reports, edited and classified, as they reached me from the different Rabbis. This appendix, if the Conference agrees, will be published in the Year Book along with this review. Such an appendix would be a graphic lesson of our needs and failings. Better than any argument I could offer, it would indicate the need for speedy and united effort.

Rabbi Landman—I want to outline in as short space of time as possible how we run our school. We have eleven grades, with eighteen teachers. Each teacher must be a graduate of a normal school and hold a position in the public schools of the city. We have, as Rabbi Solomon noted, tried a good many things in our school in the twenty-two years it has been in existence. We decided that there was no text-book of sufficient value to be used in the present day, so we use the Bible as the only text-book in the school. In the kindergarten grade and the first intermediate grade we use a series of selected stories from the Bible, which are prepared by the teachers and given to the children. In the next five grades, the intermediate department, we teach with the Bible as the text-book. The les-

sons were prepared for the teachers. The aim of each lesson is not so much to present to the pupil the Bible story or the historical incident, but to present to the pupil the religious or ethical content of that Bible story or character or post-Biblical historical incident. The teachers meet Dr. Krauskopf or myself twice every month, when we take up the question of the lesson according to the criticisms handed in by the pupils every week. They have regular forms for that. When we meet the teachers Tuesday afternoon we take up the criticisms and try to find where the trouble is. We have been on this plan three years, and are at it for the fourth time. We take lessons from the Midrash, Talmud or history. I have a lesson here on Joshua.

- The children are to read the 22d and 23d chapters. The teachers read with the pupils in the class and explain Joshua's farewell address, under these articles: First, the review of the war of Israel and exaltation, and clinging to God and His commands, and rejecting idolatry and alliances with idolatrous nations; faithfulness and unfaithfulness to God. The Israelites must take their choice here as did their fathers at Sinai. Then it says here to the teachers: "Emphasize the respect due to people who have chosen or inherited a religion. Draw a vivid picture of Joshua's farewell and death and compare this with the death of Moses; Moses speaks of the promises of the Father; Moses dies at the beginning of the conquest, Joshua at the end; both serve the people; both made the condition of the happiness of the people to depend on their clinging faithfully to God and His commandments." The teacher should be able in following out these suggestions to bring home this last suggestion to the pupil: The happiness of the people depends on their clinging faithfully to God and His commandments. As to post-Biblical history we follow the same process. In the confirmation class we have three departments. In the preconfirmation class we study the Bible alone. I teach that class. I take selections from the Bible that I think are fitted; we read and study those in the class, just as Dr. Krauskopf did when he only had a Bible class. In the confirmation class we have a series of talks,

ethical and ceremonial, and we have a post-confirmation class for children of seventeen to eighteen years old, in which we take up single subjects, and the Jews in modern times and ancient times. Out of the post-graduate class we graduate them to the institute. The young people of our congregation meet and have their own Executive Committee. I want to tell you an incident that happened this year which will show you how valuable is the work we do in our school. In Stockton Academy, Virginia, there are twelve Jewish boys, two of them are confirmators in our school. It was required of the pupils that they go to chapel. Our boys asked if they could not hold a meeting in the hall. The twelve under the lead of our two boys hold a service. One of the boys reads the services; another boy reads a selection from the Torah; a third boy delivers a sermonette. I believe with the Bible as a text-book and with the care that we take with the children, our children can be so brought up in their faith and in the knowledge of their history that they will not be afraid, twelve pupils among three hundred and eighty-two, they will not fear to ask for the establishing of a Jewish congregation in a school of the position of the Stockton Military Academy.

Rabbi Simon—We have had a rather refreshing instance today of educational iconoclasm. The first speaker threw all the ethics-books out of our curriculum. The second found no value in the history text-books. I fancy that we shall hear an equally severe arraignment of the Hebrew books. Yet to our amazement our Sabbath-Schools manage to get along fairly well, and have made, on the whole, very satisfactory progress. The progress of our schools and of the children ought not be judged by the inefficiency of our text-books. A very good text-book is a desideratum, and the absence of one is not a calamity. It is interesting to learn that Christian educators like Dr. Hall and Dr. Hodges, of the Union Theological School, find much ground for congratulating us and our schools on the work accomplished out of a period of at least two hours a week, which we manage to set aside for religious education.

Both tell us that the real value of religious education lies in its source, in the spirit which children take from their homes into the religious school. From this point of view there is not so much need for lamentation. Our children are fortunate in the traditions and religious atmosphere which pervade the home, and they come to our schools with their healthy predilections and prejudices in favor of our work.

In our school in Washington we have seven classes conducted by seven teachers. Saturday morning from 9:30 to 10 is devoted to a children's service. From time to time the children of the four highest classes accompany their teachers on a visit to the orthodox congregations, and must make a report on their visit. This becomes a part of the recitation. Classes visit the Smithsonian Institute to study the Jewish exhibit, and we have an exhibit of our own in the Sabbath-School Library, which is constantly used. From time to time the children hold recitations in the main auditorium, where the parts of the Sepher Torah are explained to them, and the ceremonies and traditions connected with the Perpetual Lamp, the Shield of David, the organ, etc., are clearly brought home to them. We have found these methods of presenting religious truth to be far more efficacious than any text-book.

Rabbi Stolz—I want to say at the outset that I did not understand that I was to present the work of my school. If that is the case, I do not think my school is any different from any other school. Therefore, if you will permit I will use my time in discussing one point presented by Rabbi Solomon which seems to be the main trouble with our Sabbath Schools. What impresses me more than aught else is what Rabbi Solomon brought out, that we do not get sufficient time for instruction in our Sabbath-School. We have thirty or forty hours in the whole year; how little can we do in that time! The other day we heard there was a minimum and maximum in religion—some want to do as little as they can, that is the minimum. I do not think we can make any criticism of our orthodox brothers in regard to the minimum when many of us are satisfied to have religious

services once a week of one hour a week. If there is anything we ought to wean ourselves from it is the terrible self-delusion that we are accomplishing with our religious schools what we ought to accomplish there. I do not say they are worthless. They accomplish a great purpose if they do nothing else but bring the children together and awaken their religious consciousness, and rich and poor all dwell together. If they hold a religious service together, and learn about the religious services that are held upstairs in the Temple, that would justify a religious school. But let us not deceive ourselves that we are teaching much in thirty hours a year. Our forefathers, before this wonderful renaissance, recognized the importance of the religious education of their children. Who is the true liberal? The one who knows something about his religion. The liberal needs to know more about his religion than the orthodox. The orthodox has everything in a book; we want to reason. Why is it our children want to take up every religious fad? Because they do not know the difference between their own religion and other religions. I know there are very learned men who are spiritually very materialistic, and I might almost say brutal, and many men and women, who are ignorant from the standpoint of religious knowledge, are still intensely religious, intensely pious, humble and God-fearing. But I say there are some things a Jew must know if he wants to be a Jew. He has got to know his Bible and prayerbook and religious ceremonial life, the difference between Jewish ethics and other ethics; he must know something about our literature and history or else he can not be a Jew. I do not know whether I understood perfectly the report of Dr. Grossman this morning. Aside from all this thing of making character and impressing personality we must strengthen the Jewish consciousness by means of Jewish knowledge. In thirty hours a year, with a week between each lesson, it is impossible to do anything of that kind. The thing of prime importance in the Jewish Sabbath-School is that we should lengthen the period of religious instruction. You say it is hard to get them to come once a

week. People say they are overburdened in the public schools, they have to take music lessons, and gymnastic lessons, how can you get them to go to the religious schools? I know many of us went to the public school and after that to the religious school each day. This has been the Einhorn meeting. You know with what scathing criticism he speaks of some kind of Sunday-School which was established in Baltimore. He ridicules the idea of having women teachers. He says women can not teach. He says you can not have a Jewish religious school. He says you can not have a school where they teach in German; they must be thorough Hebrew scholars. I do not know whether the people of our day could follow Einhorn's catechism. That book does show us how he did believe in giving thorough Jewish instruction. We must lengthen the time of instruction if we want to give real Jewish instruction to our children. Just one word as to the best feature of my Sunday-School. We have a very large confirmation class; I do not care for that. The real thing I am proud of is, we have on Monday afternoon a class of children who come on Saturday, Sunday and Monday. There are only seven in the class. I am there every Monday. If it diminishes to two, or one, I am going to be there every Monday. With the kind of teachers, with the kind of textbooks and environment, the whole thing at almost its lowest ebb, we can accomplish mighty little, except as I indicated. If we want teachers, disciples, in that new teacher's college, which is so promising a thing, we can get them only if we make provision in the Jewish Sabbath-School, and this can never be the case if we only have school for one hour a week.

I

THE OLD WELLS.

CONFERENCE SERMON BY RABBI H. G. ENELow, LOUISVILLE, KY.

"And Isaac digged again the wells of water, which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father: for the Philistines had stopped them after the death of Abraham: and he called their names after the names by which his father had called them."—Genesis xxvi, 18.

In the fervent prayers with which David Einhorn was wont to open and close his eloquent sermons, no Biblical verse occurs more often than those classic words of the patriarch: *katonti mikkol hahe sadim u-mikkol haemeth asher asitha eth abdekha*—"Unworthy am I of all the mercies and all the truth that Thou hast shown unto Thy servant!" If such a sense of humility possessed the master-preacher on all important occasions, what should I say? Deeply sensible am I of great honor in being appointed to deliver the message of this hour. I know that it is not for me to preach to you. Not for me to presume to admonish you concerning your obligations, or to correct you in opinion, or enlighten you in doctrine. The most I can do is to undertake to express some of the thoughts that we hold in common, to voice some of the convictions that are dear to us all, to clothe in words some of the feelings and aspirations which, though otherwise we may differ and dwell far apart, serve as the unbreakable cords of love and union among us all. And surely this is one of the chief blessings and beauties of these our annual assemblies; that for several days we are enabled to be together, to think and take counsel together, to feel and hope and aspire together, deriving from such community of ideas and feelings that sustenance and inspiration which nothing can surpass.

But even the task of acting as your mouthpiece on this mo-

mentous occasion might well tax the capacities of men much better qualified than I. Fortunately, the Scripture of this Sabbath comes to my aid, and proffers text and subject for a discourse, which, howsoever I may fail in my part as expositor, can not but fill this hour with meaning and inspiration. "And Isaac digged again the wells of water which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father: for the Philistines had stopped them after the death of Abraham: and he called their names after the names by which his father had called them. And the servants of Isaac digged in the valley and they found there a well of living waters." This verse suggests itself as keynote to the reflections which I would have you share with me tonight; and for one reason it is particularly fortunate and appropriate. It comprises the favorite theme of David Einhorn.

There is nothing the immortal preacher and leader loved to dwell on more than the unceasing vitality of the Jewish spirit and Jewish faith. Judaism was not to him something mechanical, anemic, stopped-up. It was something living, dynamic, full of spirit and energy—something that has always been an active and beneficent spiritual force, except in times of deterioration; and his favorite symbol was the fountain of living waters. *En mayyim ela tora*, he preached again and again, following the example of the Talmudic teachers. The fountain of living waters—ever fresh, bubbling, fructifying, reviving the soul—that he used again and again as symbol of true, vital progressive Judaism. What, then, could be more appropriate than that we fix our minds on that figure again, not only because of its own suggestiveness, but also as an added token of reverence for the memory of the teacher we are assembled to honor? Indeed, can we honor a dead teacher in any better way than by linking our thoughts to his, by joining our minds to his immortal mind, than by harking back to the concepts and ideals that dominated his soul?

Isaac, then, we are told, digged again the wells of water which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father, and which

the Philistines had stopped after the death of Abraham, and he called their names after the names by which his father had called them. It is often observed by the ancient rabbis that the patriarchs adumbrated in their life the destinies of their descendants. What happened to the fathers has befallen the children. Of one thing we may be sure, namely, that Isaac, as he is presented to us in the Scripture, typifies to a great extent the history of the people of Israel. The biography of the Jew is a reproduction on a large and universal scale of the biography of Isaac: Isaac, the peaceful, the industrious, the self-sacrificing, the sufferer, the pilgrim called upon to endure strife and enmity and peril, until finally he reaches Rehoboth—a roomy place, where freedom and opportunity and some measure of happiness are granted him. Could the life of any patriarch have foreshadowed and summarized more fully the fate of his offspring?

But if Jewish history has repeated a hundredfold the story of the patriarch's eventful pilgrimage, his sufferings and struggles, it has reproduced also some of his spiritual qualities, and none more faithfully and persistently than the quality reflected in our text. "Isaac digged again the wells which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father, and he named them after the names by which his father had called them." The spiritual quality attested by this act is filial piety. Isaac might have gone out in quest of new wells altogether; or having unearthed and uncovered the old wells, he might have given them new names, original names, names borrowed from his own time or experience. But no! He applied himself faithfully and zealously to the reopening of the old paternal wells, and when he had succeeded, he renamed those wells by the names Abraham had bestowed on them when he first had won the watery treasures from Mother Earth. Those old wells had for Isaac a deeper meaning, an added sweetness and salubrity; they were the more precious and sacred to him, because of their unforgettable association with the life and work and strivings of his father.

It is this sort of filial piety that Israel may justly be said to have repeated again and again in his religious history. If the Jew as a religious being has survived to this day; if Judaism has outlived many another creed and cult, and has come down to this twentieth century strong and energetic and vital enough to take a leading part among the faiths of the world, it has been due largely to the filial piety which has always formed one of Israel's most glorious characteristics. It is this filial piety—this historic sense, you might call it—which has again and again led the Jew, on the one hand, to reopen the old wells, and, on the other, to name them by the ancestral names. There were times when Judaism seemed decadent, when the spiritual life of the people seemed stifled, corrupted, and on the point of dissolution, when the inner meaning and purpose of the eternal truths of Judaism were forgotten, when the fountains of inspiration and religious energy seemed completely stopped by a mass of rocks and waste. There were times when one error or another, when one superstition or another, when one calamity or another, threatened to crush the very life of the old faith. Many another cult under similar conditions would have perished. Many another people under similar circumstances would have yielded to destruction. But Israel, at all such moments of deterioration and danger, fortunately possessed the genius to revive the old fountains of inspiration, to dig up again those wells of faith and hope and power which the fathers had digged, to lure forth anew the waters of salvation from the ancestral springs. And, what is more, Israel never lacked the humility and the devotion to continue to call those founts by the names the fathers had given them. That is how Judaism has triumphed in many a crisis, and has retained its place and name to this very day.

What more convincing illustration of this truth might I adduce than that furnished by those incomparable leaders and teachers, the Prophets of Israel? Rightly are they considered by men of diverse minds and beliefs as the greatest religious and moral masters mankind has ever possessed. We know that

the work they did was not only heroic, but unique, original, standing out above the level of their time and environment, emanating from their singular power of individuality. Their work was revolutionary in some respects, and but for their intercession, which required rare courage and loyalty, Judaism would have come to naught. They saved the religion of Israel from the Philistines of their time, from degradation into a mere form of Semitic idolatry, into a system of empty ceremonies and sacrifices. If ever any group of men did an original work, and that in an age of imitators and amid a world of gross idolatry, it was the Prophets of Israel. Yet these divine heroes, as Robertson Smith has pointed out, never said that they were doing or saying something that had not been known before. They came not as the givers of a new law, or apostles of a new doctrine, or originators of a new idea, or founders of a new creed. No; one and all they spoke in the name of the God of the fathers. *Adonay Elohe Abotheckhem, Elohe Abraham, Elohe Yitshaq, ve-Elohe Ya'aqob shlahani alekhem; ze sh'mi le-olam v'ze zikhri le-dor dor*—"The Lord, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you; this is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations." This message brought by Moses to his contemporaries was reiterated by every prophet in subsequent ages. Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, in their endeavor to rid their people of idolatry, to stimulate the true religious life of their contemporaries, to arouse the souls of their fellows from sleep and stupor and materialism unto a true quest of God and righteousness, did not pretend to possess a doctrine that Israel had never known before. On the contrary, their plea was for a return to the simple faith of the fathers, to the ancestral covenant of righteousness and mercy that had been forgotten, to the fountains of truth and faithfulness from which the people had strayed away. "Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord: look unto the rock whence ye were hewn and unto the hole of the pit whence ye were digged!" In short, the Prophets

made no attempt to create new wells for Israel. They sought but to dig open again the wells which had been digged in the fathers' days, and which the Philistines had stopped, and they called the wells after the names by which the fathers had called them.

The Prophets, too, were prototypes. Their example has been followed repeatedly in the course of Jewish history, and that is what has endowed the spiritual life of our people with vigor, with the eagle-like power of self-renewal, with continuity. We have neither suffered Judaism to remain a clogged-up well, to putrify and decay, nor been willing to barter its olden name for any new and more startling or fashionable appellations. Indeed, as we scan Jewish history we can not help observing that two things have always failed among us: on the one hand, the efforts of those that desired us to be content with the stopped-up wells of our ancestors; and on the other, the attempts of those who came to us with proposals to change our spiritual fortune by the adoption of new names for the good old wells.

Consider the first class. Who will deny that there were times when the old fountains of Judaism were completely arrested, and that at all such times we had our share of men who were not only willing to leave them in that miserable condition, but also regarded that condition as the only one desirable or permissible, yes, as sacred and untouchable. Our wells have been stopped again and again, and by Philistines of our own. Indeed, herein lies the tragedy of almost every significant spiritual movement in human history—the rapidity with which the message of a prophet is emptied of its inward meaning, deteriorates, petrifies, and becomes mechanical among the very people supposed to be his chief supporters and disciples. When it fell from the prophet's lips the doctrine possessed life, meaning, power, soul, it was like the very waters of life surging up from a newly discovered fountain-head, but, alas! no sooner is the prophetic voice hushed than that same message begins to be misunderstood, its vitality is gone, its sap dried up, its significance lost, and nothing is left but the outward form, the petrified

word. *Tetse ruho, yashub le-admatho, bayom ha-hu abdu eshtonothaw*—"His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth: in that very day the inward meaning of his thoughts is lost." Over and over again this tragedy of the spirit has been enacted on the stage of history; and Israel has been no exception. Our Abrahams have digged the wells, but no sooner were the Abrahams dead, than Philistines came and stopped them. Our prophetic men have opened for us the founts of the spirit, the well-heads of true righteousness, of lofty idealism, of genuine godliness. Came the Philistines—men without soul, without spirit, with eyes for the outward forms only and none for the inward truths that alone endow the forms with life and meaning—and stopped up those founts with defunct ceremonialism, with ossified laws and rules, with the debris of dogmatism, with mummies. And not content with that, these Philistines have been wont to take their stand by the stopped-up wells, contending that it mattered not at all whether the wells contained water or no, that it was not the wells that counted, but rather what had accumulated round about them and served to stop their flow—the ceremonies, the sacrifices, the dogmas, the laws, the customs and conventionalities, the mummies, those things which when first they were created and adopted by the fathers may have had high meaning indeed, but which in the course of time had lost their vitality and significance and had turned into nothing so much as a heavy heap of stones on the mouth of the fountain, making what was merit in the fathers a stumbling block in the spiritual path of the children: *Vehaeben hagedola al pi hab-b'er zu zekuth aboth*. What has saved Judaism at all such critical junctures has been the appearance of men of prophetic temperament who, in the face of the Philistines and their opposition, digged up again the old wells, rolled away the rocks and dust-heaps, tore asunder the cobwebbery of blind conservatism, liberated the soul of Judaism from the incubus of mere forms and externalities, and roused Israel anew to a realization of those fundamental aims and purposes which constitute the true spirit of Judaism.

But, on the other hand, the old names have counted, too. Our prophetic men have never failed to realize that every awakening of the soul of Israel means but a return to the spiritual idealism and capacities of the fathers. Potentially, if not actually, the highest religious and ethical forthreachings of humanity resided in the religion of Israel from the very outset. There is nothing that belongs to the realm of religious aspiration or moral resolution that the name of Judaism precludes. In the house of Judaism there is ample room for every true mansion of the spirit. Those that have come to the Jew with emphasis on some special doctrine, and desired him to accept new names and new banners, have been pathetic failures as far as Israel is concerned. The Jew has been true to his fathers. He has retained the old name for the wells of the spirit. Much as he has absorbed from his ever-changing environment, greatly as the vessels have differed into which the waters of his faith have been poured, he has never seen the need of giving new names to his religious activity and aspirations. His filial instinct has served him in good stead. He has known the difference between an Amos and a Paul, between a Micah and a Mahomet, between every true prophet who sought to restore the religious vitality of the ancestors and those apostles whose doctrine was headed in the wrong direction. Paul's effort to argue the Jew into his doctrine was as ineffectual as Mahomet's effort to force him into his. Paul's Eseq was as fruitless as Mahomet's Sitna. On the other hand, whatever effort has been made at any time to regain the Jew for the spiritual life of the fathers, to reanimate his grasp of the underlying principles of Judaism, to have him sweep away the dust and mire of ages from the ancestral fountains, has led to a deepening and broadening, and to the conservation, of Judaism, whether it was a Moses, an Amos, an Ezra, a Hillel, a Philo, a Saadya, a Maimonides, a Lurya, a Mendelssohn, a Geiger, an Einhorn, an Isaac M. Wise who acted as messenger of the age, as restorer of the old wells, as emancipator of the spirit from the shackles of mechanical conformity and meaningless externalism.

I know little of the history of Reform, and have studied Geiger and Einhorn and Holdheim to no avail, and sat without profit at the feet of our lamented teacher and leader, Isaac M. Wise, if this be not the work that Reform Judaism sought to accomplish.

In the heroic age that witnessed the birth and the battles of Reform, the warfare was twofold: On the one hand, it was directed against ossified Orthodoxy; on the other, against reckless iconoclasm and apostasy. Orthodoxy was immovably opposed to any effort in the direction of adapting the old faith to modern conditions. The new culture, the new environment, the new ideas, the new political and economic conditions meant nothing to its champions. It signified naught to them that the life-force had vanished from the major portion of their beliefs and ceremonies, and the liturgy had become mere lip-worship. Their paramount dogma was that everything that had come down from the past was sacred, inviolable, untouchable, and that every modern innovation was horrible sin and treason. On the other hand, there were the radicals, as they were called then, who were bent on going to the other extreme, who could see neither beauty, nor utility, nor holiness in all the treasures of the Jewish past, to whom there was nothing attractive either in the Jewish religion or Jewish literature, and who were not only willing but anxious to throw all Judaism, with bag and baggage, overboard into the weltering ocean of the new life. To this class belonged not only the hosts of those who, divorced from all principle and conscience, accepted baptism for worldly reasons altogether, but also a goodly number of such as were influenced by non-Jewish teaching and had honestly, though shallowly, arrived at the conclusion that the part of Judaism was at an end, and that they could make themselves more useful to the spiritual life of humanity if they exchanged their Jewish name and heritage for some appellation more modern and comprehensive. Between these two danger points the good ship of Judaism found itself at that critical hour; between the Scylla of a petrified Orthodoxy and the Charybdis of a thought-

less iconoclasm. What saved Judaism from foundering was that the strong arm of Reform seized the helm. Under the captaincy of Geiger and his disciples and fellow-workers, Judaism was guided safely out of that perilous condition.

The pioneers of reform battled against both extremes. They fought against both camps of the Philistines. They fought for a Judaism purified, purged of the meaningless accretions of the ages, delivered from the dead weight of sheer ceremonialism and dogmatism and superstition, lifted anew to the high and pure principles of godliness and righteousness which the prophets had preached and the patriarchs had conceived. But, also, they fought for retention of the old name and the old banner. They did not want to be known as mere humanitarians, or ethical culture teachers, or apostles of a new cosmopolitanism. Not theirs the dream of a New Religion. They fought for the preservation of the good old historic name of Judaism, which had through so many centuries of struggle and martyrdom and aspiration formed the unconquerable banner of Israel, and was still broad enough to enfold the loftiest religious and ethical concepts of which mankind was capable. The old wells—cleansed, purified, uncovered afresh, freed from the dust and debris of the ages—the old wells Reform Judaism dugged up again, those very wells that the fathers, the prophets, mankind's spiritual nobles had delved, but which the Philistines had stopped—those pristine wells did Reform dig up again, and it named them anew after the names by which the fathers had called them.

That is how Reform has been responsible for the salvation of Judaism in modern times. Without Reform, Judaism would have entered upon a period of gradual decadence in the Western World. There might have been apostasy, superstition and lingering apathy; there could have been no virile, active, steadfast, progressive Judaism—a Judaism loyal, on the one hand, to the essential traditions of the past, and vital enough, on the other, to satisfy the demands and suit the conditions of the present. The Jewish consciousness—the realization of what Judaism really stands for, of what are its central truths, of

what it has meant to the civilization of the world, and of how wonderful and heroic a history it has produced—the Jewish consciousness did not have to wait for its awakening upon the advent of modern antisemitism and its step-child, Viennese Zionism. Geiger evoked it with his Moses' staff like a stream of fresh water from the heart of the people—Einhorn, Wise, and their fellow-laborers summoned it from its centuries' slumber to new life and power—Reform was the mighty agent of its regeneration.

Latterly we have heard much concerning the futility and the foolishness of Reform. Critics have arisen denouncing it as a peril to Judaism, as a source of Jewish decadence and disintegration, as the bridge leading from the synagogue to the church. We must revive Orthodoxy, we are told; we need a reaction—return to the religion of the ghetto is what we need. All we can say to such assailants of Reform is, in the words of Isaiah: "Who is blind but my servant? or deaf as my messenger? Thou seest many things, but thou observest not; his ears are open, but he heareth not." As for ourselves we know full well that but for the kinetic influence of Reform, even the so-called Neo-Orthodoxy and its tribe of relations that thrive on opposition and disparagement of Reform, would never have come into being.

Our task, however, is not to waste time on wrangles with our opponents. Little danger there is of Reform being driven from the field by a sudden resuscitation of medieval Orthodoxy. In fact, there is demand today, and, thank heaven, room enough in this country for all genuine Jewish work, under whatever name it may go: *ki atta hirhib Adonay lanu u-pharatsnu baarets*, "for now the Lord hath made room for us, and we are prosperous in this land." There is a great demand nowadays for any sort of Jewish work that is free from hypocrisy, from hollowness, from cant. Our duty today is to keep alive the altar fires kindled by the leaders of the past century. Or, to return to our text, our duty is to keep on digging in the valley for the well of living waters—in the valley of modern life for the main-springs of Jewish idealism. In the valley, not only on the

mountain sides; among the mass of our people, amidst their daily life and occupations and strivings, we must seek to recover the free flow of the old stream of Jewish idealism. For are we not facing a new famine today that may be as serious in its consequences as any of the famines of former times? *Vayehi raabh baarets milbhad haraabh harishon asher haya biyme Abraham*. Our duty is to carry on the spiritual and ethical work our predecessors began. Our duty is to do whatever we can, not only toward preserving those religious truths and spiritual forces which have belonged to Israel from time immemorial and for the renewal and recovery and expansion of which the masters of Reform fought their great battles, but also toward making them active agencies in the everyday life of the modern Jew and Jewess. Let us beware lest the wells which Geiger and Einhorn and Wise restored are stopped again by the Philistines now that the fathers are dead!

Yes, in the valley of life let us keep on digging for the old wells. Let us strive on to open for the modern Jew the well of the Thora, of Religious Knowledge. Is not ignorance of Judaism one of the most serious maladies of our age? There is the famine of our land! All sections it embraces, and nothing is a greater bane to our spiritual life. And by ignorance I do not mean merely unfamiliarity with the more delicate problems of Jewish life or the more subtle speculations of religion or the more remote events of our history: what I have in mind is the appalling spread of the grosser form of ignorance—ignorance of our Bible, our prayers, our principles and purpose—of the Am Haarez type, absence of that fundamental Jewish knowledge and spiritual understanding which the prophets designated as *Daath Elohim*, and without which the people can not but perish. "What is the cause of Israel's defilement and debasement?" asks the ancient rabbi; "it is that they have no understanding in the words of the Thora." It is not Reform, nor Orthodoxy that forms the chief menace of our age; it is ignorance, stupidity, arrogant philistinism. "It is stupidity alone," says Carlyle, "with never so many rituals, that kills

religion." It is certainly a shame and a snare to modern Judaism.

Also, the well of moral purity let us protect from clogging. One holy task we have before us, all of us, that of battling against the moral degeneration of our people. Oh, think of the magnitude of this task! To what insignificant proportions does all else dwindle! To what dust and ashes are all academic issues and metaphysical controversies reduced, in the face of the grave problem of the conservation of the moral character of Israel! The seriousness of the situation we all know. We all know what has happened in Chicago, in New York, and what is happening more or less in every other community. Is there any work with greater claim on the attention and service of every Jewish leader, of every disciple of the prophets, than this of saving the honor of the Jew from pollution and the character of Israel from disintegration? What matters East or West? What matters Orthodox or Reform? What matters liberalism or conservatism, when that has become the problem? Shall it be said of the Jew that the well of purity, the mainspring of character, which he saved in the long and dreary periods of Contention and Enmity, he is too weak to preserve in the midst of prosperity and freedom—at Rehoboth?

And, finally, let us keep on trying to dig up again the well of spiritual idealism in Israel and Humanity. In common with all other spiritual agencies we have to fight against the universal disease of our age—materialism. Materialism is undermining the structure of Judaism, as well as that of other faiths. We might witness the desuetude of this or that ceremony, the passing of this or that form of piety, the neglect of this or that festival or institution, without alarm or serious apprehension. But to think of so many of our Jews and Jewesses, children of the most spiritual of peoples, children of an incomparable ancestry of prophets and seers and idealists—to see them descend to the basest levels of materialism, imperturbably ensconced in the contentment of their creature comforts and carriages and gowns and automobiles and cheap theatres

and gaudy restaurants—well, to tell truth, there is nothing more grotesque, monstrous in the world, and nothing more agonising to the lover of Israel and Israel's glorious past. *Hith-naari me-aphar qumi sh'bi Yerushalayim*—"Shake thyself from the dust; stand up, O captive daughter of Jerusalem!" may well be our message to our people today, and engross our best efforts and thoughts in behalf of Israel.

Oh, that this Conference may inspire us anew with love and zeal for our work. Many are the difficulties and disappointments and trials! Like Isaac, we must needs meet with much Esek and Sitna in the delving for the old wells. But may the work and the feelings which we share here together bless us with new courage and determination, and reinvigorate the fountains of hope and confidence within us, and lead us to Rehoboth—the liberation and enlargement of the Spirit. Let us continue to guard against the Philistines the wells of our ancestral faith, the fountains of truth and righteousness, the olden springs of our prophetic religion, that by our toil the great day may be brought nearer which the Prophet forecast in his noble vision: "I will pour water upon the thirsty and streams upon the dry ground. I will pour my spirit upon thy children and my blessing upon their offspring: and they shall spring up among the grass, as willows by the watercourses. One shall say, I am the Lord's: and another shall proclaim the name of Jacob, and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel." Amen!

J

SAMUEL ADLER.

Tribute Pronounced at the Celebration of the Centenary of
His Birth:

RABBI JOSEPH SILVERMAN, NEW YORK CITY.

We owe a great debt to the memory of Rabbi Samuel Adler. He was a thorough and modest scholar—a man of true culture and native nobility—a man of poise and dignity, of quiet ease, chaste simplicity and refinement. Unobtrusive, he was content to lead the life of a student delving deep into the rich fountains of Israel's literature and adding thereto what he could from his storehouse of classical and philosophic knowledge. Upon his early Hebrew training, received at his native town of Worms, he delicately grafted the modern thought which he had imbibed at the universities of Frankfort and Giessen. Intellectually he was a composite of the old Hebrew learning and temperament and the new logical and critical method of the universities. His character was formed by the storm and stress of life through which he was compelled to pass. Born December 3, 1809, in a large family, bordering on deprivation of life's sustenance, he struggled ever forward and upward intellectually and spiritually.

This strength of character and intellectual acumen combined with intense religiosity and a fervor for progress, made of him one of those men who leave an impress on their day and generation and on the pages of history.

As a scholar he diligently plowed the fields of Jewish learning and left many monographs on important subjects, as for example: "A Biblio-Critical Study of Passover," "The Day of Atonement according to the Bible—Its Origin and Meaning," "The Levitical Tithe," "Phariseeism and Sadduceeism," "Karaitic Questions," "The Talmud," "Tenets of Faiths and their Authority in the Talmud."

As Rabbi and preacher in Worms, from 1836-1842; in Alzey, 1842-1857, and later in New York, he gained a local, national and international reputation for elegant diction, depth and breadth of thought, for fervid impassioned speech and convincing oratory. He never preached merely for the sake of entertainment. The claptrap sensational preaching of our day would have disgusted him. He filled his pulpit completely by his ability, his character, his intense earnestness, and above all, by the message which he brought week after week to his congregation. If he had nothing else to commend him to the Rabbis of today, that fact in itself would be sufficient to interest them in his career and his method. He labored throughout the week, whether in his study or in his various pastoral duties, to listen for the revelation of God, and when he caught the divine message, aflame with the word from Heaven, he went to his pulpit, calm and deliberate, fearless and independent, to speak as he felt he was commissioned by the Most High. He understood the spirit of Judaism—he cared not for the letter.

This conception of his sublime duty as a messenger of God raised Adler above every petty worldly consideration, and made him strong and fearless enough to preach his inmost convictions. He was an exponent of our ancestral faith interpreted by the light of modern thought. He based his reform not merely, as has been so often falsely charged against reform, on the needs of convenience, but on the conviction that Judaism was not a dead letter—not an ironclad faith and a fixed form—never to be revised or altered—but rather that our religion was progressive from the very hour it was first proclaimed to the present day, that there never was a time when it did not undergo changes in its theological dicta—its ceremonial functions and its levitical and civil laws.

He showed his opponents, who based their rigid orthodoxy on Bible and Talmud, that those very repositories of Hebrew learning contained the history of the development of Judaism and sanctions for every change proffered by the reformers.

Adler's Judaism was the ethical monotheism of Moses and

the prophets. To him God was the creative and moral force of the universe, the power that makes for righteousness. He preached moral obligation of man to his fellowman based upon man's obligation to obey the law of God. To him the ethical import of Judaism outweighed every form and ritual. The creed, the prayer, the ceremonials were only concrete vessels necessary to carry to mind and heart the spirit of truth, duty, justice and love. The vessels might be repaired or changed as often as necessary, but the ethical spirit always remained the same. And when they did not carry this spirit the vessels were empty and useless.

Samuel Adler was an active member of the first three Rabbinical Reform Conferences held in Brunswick in 1844, in Frankfort-on-the-Main 1845 and in Breslau 1846. These Rabbinical assemblies have become historic. They laid the foundation of that Reform Judaism that has saved the Judaism of thousands from utter decline and obloquy. The men who formed those early conventions deserve the everlasting gratitude of all Israel. Judaism was on the verge of dissolution in Germany. Those men buttressed the weak parts, strengthened the enfeebled battlements and brought new vitality into the moribund synagogue. They discussed the crying needs of Judaism with earnestness, fearlessness, with deep research into causes and consequences, and were pervaded with a high sense of their duty to their faith, their people, their God. Samuel Adler stood amongst those stalwarts in the house of Israel, head and shoulders the equal of all.

At the Brunswick Conference Adler expressed himself vigorously in favor of a reform of the liturgy, and when the right to change the ritual was challenged he cried out: "What right have we to reform?—The traditional right to modify the Biblical ceremonial according to temporal and local conditions. The question was often asked whence we obtained that right. From the people. The free will of the people recognized the Talmudists, the free will of the people will recognize us. We, too, are Talmudists. Hence, we can insist on the same right."

His first attitude on the Sabbath was taken at the same Conference of Brunswick, 1844, when a Sabbath Commission was appointed to determine whether Sabbath observance could not be preserved without Sabbath rest. Samuel Adler was a member of this Commission, his associates being Geiger, A. Adler, Wechsler and Kahn. The specific resolution on which this Commission was to act read as follows: "If there were any means by which we could reconcile Jewish doctrines and the demands of modern life in reference to the Sabbath." The report of the Commission was not unanimous, especially with regard to the fundamental basis of the Sabbath. The majority declared that the Sabbath was primarily a day of rest and only secondarily a day of consecration, and laid greater stress on the observance of the day as a time of cessation from all work.

Adler took strong objection, claiming that the Sabbath was fundamentally a day of self-consecration to higher ideals and contended that mere idleness was not a proper observance of the Sabbath, but that this consisted in sanctifying thought and sentiment by worship and prayer.

Adler favored great latitude in regard to labor on the Sabbath when necessary for the preservation of life, or an income for the maintenance of the individual or family, was most liberal in his interpretation of Sabbath law, favored even a modified service on Sunday, but was strongly opposed to a transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday.

The question of eliminating Hebrew from the ritual to some extent and substituting prayers in the vernacular, was hotly debated in the second Rabbinical Conference of Germany, held at Frankfort-on-Main in 1845. Adler also attended these meetings and took an earnest part in the debates, especially favoring the resolution to retain Hebrew only in typical parts of the service and to put the rest of the ritual in the German language.

On the status of woman in the Synagogue Adler was most pronounced, and himself introduced in the third Conference

of Germany a resolution declaring that woman had the same obligation as man to participate in the instruction in Judaism and in the public service, and that the custom to exclude women in the number of individuals necessary for conducting a public service was only a custom and had no religious basis."

In the year 1857 the scene of Adler's career shifts from the Old World to the New, and thenceforward assumes even a greater importance on the horizon of Judaism. He was twenty-one years a Rabbi in Germany, and thirty-four years a Rabbi in Temple Emanu-El of New York, though he was active only seventeen years of the thirty-four.

He was the fourth of that great quartet that arrived in this country in the fifth and sixth decades of the 19th century. Max Lilienthal came in 1845, Isaac M. Wise in 1846, David Einhorn in 1855 and Samuel Adler in 1857. They had all been preceded by Leo Merzbacher, who, in 1845, became Rabbi of Temple Emanu-El of New York, and deserves the credit of being the first Rabbi of a reform congregation in America. It is a pity that the learned editors of the Jewish Encyclopedia neglected to give a biography of Leo Merzbacher, the pioneer reform Rabbi of America. He blazed a path through the virgin forest which all the other reformers followed and extended. He published, under the copyright of Temple Emanu-El, the first Reform Prayerbook issued in this country. A few years later, after Samuel Adler had become Rabbi of Emanu-El, the officers of this congregation appointed a committee to invite other congregations to co-operate in creating a union Prayerbook. Dr. Einhorn immediately refused to co-operate because, as he claimed, he was preparing his own Prayerbook. The Emanu-El Committee therefore disbanded, and Dr. Samuel Adler was authorized to revise the Merzbacher Prayerbook. He performed the task in such an acceptable manner that the Adler book, including the principles on which it was based which were published in the preface, became the pattern for nearly all other reform rituals in this country, and remained the only ritual of Temple

Emanu-El until the adoption of the present Union Prayerbook in the year 1894. In the discussion on prayerbook manufacture in these latter days this fact is often studiously overlooked, and the credit that is due to Merzbacher and Adler as successful pioneer Reformers is withheld from them.

Adler was the quiet student and scholar, but he could and did none the less strenuously break a lance in the championship of reform in Germany and America. As an evidence of the vigor of his preachment let me quote from his first Pass-over sermon delivered in Temple Emanu-El.

"Our situation is like that of the Israelites immediately after their deliverance from Egypt. Behind us lies Egypt, the middle ages; before us the sea of Talmudic legislation not yet cleaved through flood. Let then the rod be raised to cleave it (this Talmudic sea). Backwards we can not go; to stand still means death. Then let us forward—forward across the sea."

It may also be news to some that Adler had a share in the reform movement in Chicago that culminated in the organization of the Sinai Temple of that city. The promoters of the Sinai Congregation asked him to outline what course a reformed congregation should pursue, and he answered bravely as follows: "I would state that the first and most important step for such a congregation to take is to free its service of shocking lies, to remove from it mention of things and wishes which we would not utter if it had to be done in an intelligible manner. Such are the lamentation about oppression and persecution, the petition for the restoration of the sacrificial cult, for the return of Israel to Palestine, the hope for a personal Messiah, and for the resurrection of the body. In the second place, let us eliminate fiction and exaggeration; and in the third place, make the service clear, intelligible, instructive and inspiring."

All the latterday sententious talk, therefore, as to new stars who alone first showed the way that leads from the Orient to the Occident, and from the Occident direct to the throne of

God without the bypaths of obsolete ceremonials and prayerful circumlocution is purely gratuitous. *Adler was the original constellation that lit the other stars.* 'Tis a pity that we are called upon to do his memory this tardy justice.

Adler was not merely a scholar—a preacher—a thinker. He was also a man of action. Like Isaac M. Wise, he combined within himself both the man of thought and the man of action. In Germany in his early career he began to take an active interest in communal life, and labored strenuously and successfully to affect the removal of the disabilities of the Jews. Through his efforts the authorities of Worms were persuaded to permit the teaching of Judaism in the lower and higher schools on the same conditions on which Christianity was taught in those schools.

The unfortunate of the communities in which he lived did not escape his attention, and he is said to have co-operated in the creation of several charitable institutions both in Europe and America. And let it be especially mentioned that he was amongst the founders of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum of this city (New York).

He was greatly concerned about the religious training of the young, and in Germany laid the foundation of valuable improvement in this direction in the city and rural schools under his jurisdiction. As Rabbi of Temple Emanu-El he bestowed great care upon religious instruction and established a school that, for those days, was a model of its kind, and after which many other congregations patterned their own schools. It is comparatively easy for us to build successfully today, but men like Merzbacher, Adler and others deserve the greatest honor because they were pathfinders in the virgin forest and builders of highways in the wilderness.

In the progress of the reform movement in Temple Emanu-El, Adler was a potent factor, and what had been so auspiciously begun under Merzbacher, the first rabbi of this congregation, was gloriously advanced under Adler. It is not my office here

to outline the place that Emanu-El has gained in the onward march of progressive Judaism, but whatever that place may be, whatever this congregation has been able to do for the welfare of our faith has been but a superstructure on the foundation that has been laid by Adler and his generation. Gustav Gottheil, as Adler's colaborer and successor, continued in the same spirit of fearless advocacy of a Judaism pure and simple, acceptable to the philosopher and intelligible to the child, beloved by the devout, progressive Jew and admired by the intelligent, unprejudiced gentile.

Samuel Adler was an uncompromising Jew, and noted for the thorough Jewishness of his thought and preaching, of the ideals and the aspiration he cherished for Judaism and Israel. And he was, at the same time, an intense American, his love for this country taking on the form of an exalted passion. In the Civil War his pen and speech served the cause of the abolition of slavery. For Abraham Lincoln he had an unbounded admiration, verging on reverence. One of his children told me that when Adler read of the assassination of Lincoln he wept like a child, so deeply affected was he by the sudden news of the great catastrophe that had befallen the nation. He felt the death of Lincoln as a personal loss.

Like most great strong men, Adler had a soft and tender heart. His sympathies were easily invoked for the needy and unfortunate. He was the great preacher in the pulpit and the comforting pastor in the house of mourning. If he was great as a scholar and a preacher, he rose to supernal heights when his heart was lifted up in prayer to God. He truly walked before the Lord and became perfect—and therefore he could pray as few men can.

He seemed to see God face to face, so real was the Divine Being to him. His prayers were not mere words—no empty lip service—but the true outpouring of a soul that was touched by the live coal from the altar. His prayer was the voice of finite mind in touch with the infinite Mind, the pulse beat of

the heart of a man moving in tune with the infinite Heart of the universe.

He walked before the Lord on earth. He rests in the bosom of his God forever and aye. It is one hundred years since he saw the light, but the words he spoke, and the deeds he did, are the angels that will sing his song of Immortality, throughout the ages.

K

OBITUARY ADDRESS—ADOLPH MOSES RADIN.

BY RABBI NATHAN STERN, TRENTON, N. J.

It has been given to few Rabbis in the American ministry to devote themselves to a sphere of influence so peculiarly unlimited in the opportunity it offered for thought and work as was furnished to the late Rev. Dr. Adolph Moses Radin. He served no fashionable congregation. His personality made him preeminently a man of the people, the recipient of much of their enthusiasm and esteem. His chosen field of power brought him face to face with the difficult and complex problems of Jewish life of lower New York City; problems, gigantic in their proportion, terrific except for the resolute and the brave; problems requiring sympathy, patience, endurance, great powers of recuperation, giving little leisure for the ease and the research of the study, exacting all the energy, all the strength and will the individual can command in the heroic battle of the Lord. Rabbi Radin's life and work were a very important part in the more or less systematized attempt to raise the tone of the moral, intellectual and spiritual life in the congested districts of the metropolis.

Adolph Moses Radin was born August 5, 1845, at Neustadt-Schirwindt in Poland, a province whose fertile soil grows Jewish scholars. He sprang from typically Jewish stock that is characterized by strong emotion and by rigid observance of custom, the flower of whose youth is dedicated to study and to the law. His Rabbinic training he received at Velozhin and Eiseshok, whence he obtained his *Semichah*. He was thus a product of *Cheder* and *Yeschibah*, which for centuries have produced in Poland and Russia thorough Hebrew scholars and splendid Talmudists. But after a strange Jewish fashion the peculiar fixedness of habit and tradition common to Jewish life in Poland

and in Russia has been interwoven time and time again with a stubborn independence of thought and a bold insistence upon carrying thought into practice.

This independence of thought, developed, no doubt, by attendance at the Universities of Berlin, Königsberg and Greifswald—by the last of which he was awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy—made Dr. Radin an advocate of progress and of reform, a future member of this Conference. For a comparatively short time he was Rabbi at Mehve and Kempen in Prussia, and at Kalisz and Lodz in Poland. But the spirit of independence induced him to seek a new field of activity wherein greater freedom might be given to his liberal views. In the autumn of 1886 he came to America, and one month after landing became Rabbi of the Jewish Congregation at Elmira, N. Y., and visiting Jewish Chaplain of the New York State Reformatory in that city. "My work at the Elmira Reformatory," he stated in a paper before this Conference, "enabled me to judiciously, and, I may add, successfully apply my labors and efforts in behalf of our erring brethren, who were serving terms of imprisonment in state prison, in the penitentiary, in the workhouse or in institutions for juvenile delinquents." From Elmira he was called to the Congregation Gates of Hope in New York City, and in 1890 he entered upon his noble and distinctive work as Chaplain of all the penal institutions of New York and Brooklyn, to which was later added the duties of spiritual leadership of the People's Synagogue at the Educational Alliance.

On February 4, 1909, almost twenty-five years after he was given the first opportunity to bring messages of kindness, of cheer, of hope, of encouragement to those socially ostracized, death brought to a close a career dedicated to social improvement, to the help of the poor, the needy and the sick; to the guidance of the immigrant and to the reclaiming of social offenders. Truly applicable of him are Isaiah's words: "I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee and give thee for a covenant of the

people, for a light to the gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." **מהספרו של אדם נכר אם בן**

עלום הוא אם לא Surely the last tribute that a people pay to the dead is generally a safe guide that the ministrations of the departed will have an abiding influence though his individual effort shall have ceased. The forty thousand persons who, it was estimated, followed the funeral cortege as it passed from this building in which we, his colleagues, are gathered to do honor to his memory, gave a sincere and well merited testimony, a final reward to the hardworking Rabbi, to his genial personality, to his unflinching service in the cause of humanity. **אחר מבני החבורה שמח יראנו כל בני החבורה** An entire community, mourning its loss, placed the crown of approval and appreciation upon a labor of love.

At the time when Dr. Radin cast his lot with his brethren in New York, the overcrowded sections thereof had become a seething sea of humanity into which a steady stream of immigrants was yearly pouring. Poles, Russians, Galicians, Lithuanians, Roumanians, with their varied sympathies and prejudices, pressed hard upon each other. Some were fugitives from oppression, seeking here an asylum and refuge. Some were drawn hither by the desire to try their fortunes anew and to wrest from this land of opportunity the meed of noble, conscientious effort. The visionary, the dreamers, the idealist, the poet, the scholar, the criminal were huddled together, each reacting upon the other. In all an impressionable mass—a tremendous power for good or for ill!

As things being equal, the controlling force was for evil. Overcrowding in itself drains society of its strength, by impairing the physical efficiency of men and of women, yea, of entire families, making industrial success for such well nigh impracticable. Overcrowding attacks the community in its most vulnerable spot, where it least can afford the strain. It is all but impossible to maintain conditions of decency and of

morality in overcrowded houses and tenements. The social offender is thereby nurtured, and, without any exertion, he is made party to wrong and to vice. Furthermore, high rentals and large families, especially where wages are low—a state common to the Jewish quarter—are, in themselves, conditions very favorable towards fostering crime: for every additional demand upon the family purse must be met by villainy, by the sale of self for immoral purposes or by a further reduction of the food supply, already too meagre and inadequate. Such reduction and retrenchment must necessarily lead to physical, moral, intellectual degeneration. Overcrowding, poverty, physical inefficiency, high mortality, and crime are intimately related.

With all his heart and soul Rabbi Radin labored against what seem almost overwhelming odds. Resolutely, cheerfully he continued the struggle and gave battle to the social hydra.

He was a practical helper, an ideal and zealous communal worker. To any cause, to any proposition that would alleviate suffering and sickness and thereby tend to raise the physical efficiency of his people, that would develop the intellect and stimulate moral consciousness, he proffered his staunch approval and vigorous support. His genius lay in his unusually marked ability to collect funds needed to carry on the crusade against disease, ignorance and vice. His services were constantly in demand and as constantly rendered. Some time in its history almost every Jewish activity for social or religious uplift in New York was indebted to him for co-operation. His services will be sadly missed by many a worthy, struggling cause.

Furthermore, Dr. Radin was an educator, one well equipped to work among his people. Having been a foreigner, he had first had knowledge of the intellectual, religious, social and economic difficulties that beset the Jews before they emigrated to the United States. The German University had secured him breath of view and had provided him with sufficient critical acumen to judge social phenomena, to correlate facts and to grasp causes and effects. The *Yeschibah* had made him an erudite Hebrew scholar, at home in the sources, and assured

him recognition even from the scholarly element of the people among whom his tasks lay. Whether we agree or do not agree with him in all his thought, it must be confessed that his poetic temperament which found expression in his forceful championship of Zionism added greatly to his popularity in some quarters and provided him a respectful hearing at all times. And his great humor, his striking sarcasm and wit, his easy approach, his ready, sympathetic, earnest response to the call of the individual and of the community won him friendship and trust. And, withal, he was an orator whose manner was telling and true.

Wherefore, as Rabbi of the People's Synagogue at this Educational Alliance and as speaker upon occasion his influence was extensive. The paramount issue of which he never lost sight was to be, so far as he was able, a guide to the perplexed; to remove the intellectual difficulties of his hearers, to supply their religious wants and to encourage their moral aspirations. A covenant of life and of peace was with him; truth was in his mouth and many he turned away from sin, for he was a messenger of the Lord of Hosts.

Especially solicitous was he of the immigrants to whom he was indeed a missionary, warning them of the pitfalls they would encounter, guiding them to usefulness and assisting them to become respectable American citizens. "In all my lectures and addresses before the immigrant," he said in one of his reports, "I have tried to arouse the spirit of self-respect and an earnest desire for self-help and support. The most favorable results I have achieved by my missionary work for the moral and intellectual elevation of many immigrants are visible in the grand success of the Russian American Hebrew Association."

Though Dr. Radin was a communal worker and an educator in no rare degree he will probably be best remembered as worker among the Jewish inmates of jails, reformatory and prison. In this work he was the pioneer among American Rabbis.

The career of a prison chaplain is not always a fascinating one even for him who can enjoy this particular work. It may

be exceedingly depressing and enervating. The seamy side of life is reflected in strong, glaring relief. The weaknesses of man, by being seen at too close a range, are often exaggerated. And the diseases of society are beheld cruelly gnawing at the vitals of our brethren, blindly driving to their logical end. The prison chaplain is in imminent danger of being bereft of his confidence in human integrity and of his trust in his fellowman. When strong in the belief of having reclaimed a soul for the simple, normal life, the chaplain awakens to find that he has again been deceived and that his labor has been in vain. Sturdy and stalwart, Rabbi Radin met his tests. After every failure he entered the lists afresh and from defeat he wrung victory. With characteristic directness he made confession. "I also have experienced many disappointments, which, however, have not discouraged me in the least." His good sense of humor and the extreme sunniness of his personality dispelled the shadows that might linger in his own path.

On the whole his estimate of crime and of the criminal was sound. "False pride," he wrote, "and a ridiculously exaggerated affectation in our moral views have induced us to look upon the criminal with contempt and scorn, not with compassion and sympathy. This standpoint is neither truly Jewish nor humane. Every sinner has, in a certain degree, a claim upon our loving kindness. We must look upon the criminal as upon a patient.

אין אדם עברו עברה אלא אם כן נכנס בו רוח שטנים 'No man sins except that a spirit of madness has taken possession of him' is a wise and noble saying of our sages. Most of the criminals are the national products of their surroundings and circumstances. Very few of them have become stained with guilt and crime entirely through themselves. Thousands of hands have invisibly worked on their moral depravity until they ran into their own ruin."

Sound on the whole as were the sentiments of Dr. Radin with regard to crime, and willing as I am to yield to his greater, wider, riper experience, I fear his views are a little too sanguine. There is being formed among our people, by birth as well as

through habit my limited study assures me, as fine, as clever and as thorough type of criminal as may be found anywhere. The only distinction that possibly should be made is that our own are not as numerous and that they do not, as a rule, run the entire gamut of crime. They rather limit their predatory war to a few phases thereof.

As his reports indicate, Dr. Radin was justified in directing much of his pains toward saving the first offender, while still in the jails and before he had been sent to penal institutions. Once introduced to reformatory or prison, the probability is that the convict returns to society with all the rights and privileges of a graduate from the high school and university of crime. Dr. Radin's work, it seems to me, imposes a solemn obligation upon us, more especially upon the leader in the smaller communities, to acquaint ourselves with court happenings, to save the Jewish youth while the mind and heart are still open to suggestion and, when possible, to spare the unfortunates the shame, the degradation of prison life.

It is very difficult, indeed, to do effective corrective work among the inmates of penitentiaries. So many influences militate against it. The system by which are appointed the officials, more generally the minor officials at our penal institutions who come into closest contact with the prisoner himself, may counteract the work of the chaplain. Appointments are usually a matter of political spoil and plunder rather than of proficiency and fitness. Through ignorance not so much, I believe, as by carelessness and illwill the blundering official, misunderstanding the offenders, rouses in them a greater hatred for law, and furnishes them another reason for "getting even," and unconsciously encourages malevolent designs. Until the offender is studied and treated with as much care and consideration as a patient in a sick ward of a hospital or in the pavilion of an asylum, our reformatories will remain bankrupt and be failures so far as corrective work in the main is concerned. Until scientific methods are employed and keepers thoroughly adapted for the work are engaged, men like Dr. Radin have a hard road

to travel, to win the confidence of the incarcerated and to wean them from sin.

Moreover, the criminal himself is the gravest obstacle to reform, the main source of perplexity for the chaplain. The population of prisons are separable into two large classes: the criminal and the offender. The former are those who by nature prefer a life of violence and who are rarely amenable to treatment and reform. They comprise those who are criminals by birth, through habit or by profession until, by repeated confinement it be brought home to them that as a profession crime does not pay. The latter are more often fallow ground from which the seed of life, once planted, produces healthy results. All things being equal, they may become very valuable members of society. We should not call them criminals, for they are not criminals except in a very limited sense, though their offense be ever so great. There may be those who transgress in their youth, or who are driven to deeds of pillage and carnage through stress of passion and outraged affection, by hunger, deprivation, extreme necessity and economic disasters. It is not always easy to distinguish the one class from the other inasmuch as the gravity of the offense is as little indicative of real criminal nature as the triviality of the wrong done is sure testimony of more normal disposition. Here, as elsewhere, study and experience are the avenues to knowledge. And Dr. Radin was expert.

To all who would take, he gave solace and cheer. To comfort them, to raise their self-respect, to furnish them a reason for a stronger fight, to live properly and honorably, to provide them homes and employment lest by neglect they return to shame was the guiding purpose of his life. To use a borrowed simile, he was like a bird which, seeing the blossoms rent from the healthy vine by the storms that beat upon them, tries to save them from destructive and attempts to replant them. Had he done nothing more he would have merited our unbounded thanks and sincere tribute. To a greater degree than most men, he illustrated that when properly directed, "the spirit of man is the candle of the Lord."

L

THE WORKINGMAN AND THE SYNAGOGUE.

BY RABBI SOLOMON FOSTER, NEWARK, N. J.

"As you walk through the swelling and ever-swelling and sweltering New York Ghetto of a summer evening, the truth of it becomes verified within your innermost feelings. . . . Wherever you turn you see your own, your own; so many, so many of them. You are glad; you are proud. . . . You may have nothing in common with them in your outlook and aspirations, nothing in your daily life and conduct; still you love your people, you love them well; in spite of yourself you love them. You love them also in spite of themselves. They are full of faults, big and little; they grate and jar upon your senses in every one of their daily doings; a thousand times a day they offend your highly strung sensibilities; still you love them; you know you love them." (Jew. Chronicle, September 18, 1908, p. 14.)

In these words "Halitvack" gives us a sympathetic glimpse into the seething, suffering, struggling mass; the indifferent, yet religious and idealistic populace; the aspiring, fighting, laughing, toiling, studying, peaceful human beings who make up New York's East Side. Every road of my investigation into the conditions of the Jewish workingman led to this place. It is here that the Jewish immigrant gets his first knowledge of America; it is here he finds the means of a livelihood; here he meets his relatives, friends and countrymen; here he makes or finds himself at home with his people, in the midst of a great city, yet apart from it.

The road to the East Side proved to be a short road to my goal, the investigation of the Jewish workingman in his relationship to the Synagogue, for within a comparatively narrow area live some 750,000 Jewish souls, as it is estimated, the

largest settlement of Jews in one city that the world has ever known. In this district are to be found some of the largest industrial plants in the country, which explains the presence of an enormous laboring class. Almost every conceivable object is manufactured in this section, and all kinds of labor can be secured, from the skilled diamond cutter and steel engraver to "the hewer of wood and the drawer of water." Here men, women and children early and late hear the busy whirr of the machines as they earn their daily bread, or long to hear it, when loss of employment or a slack season make them feel more keenly the pinch of poverty. On the East Side all the glory and the grandeur of an industrial age are to be seen; the almost human sensitiveness and efficiency of machinery; the organization and equipment of great factories; the nice calculations of human and machine capacity; the great buildings for mercantile, industrial, educational and philanthropic purposes, the fruits of the splendid risks and bold adventures of progressive capitalists.

Here also flourish and multiply all the degradation and vice of an industrial age. Here are exhibited on all sides the remnants of spiritual beings turned to tools. Machines answer the anguish and sorrow of the workmen with a meaningless roar, and reply to their cry for sympathy and help with an incessant, unremitting cruel clamor. The diseases of occupation are here taken from the realm of the theoretical into that of such accurate prediction as to make it possible for the scientist to compute by age and number the percentage of deaths in the various trades. Here we see youths lashed to machines when society should have guaranteed them sunshine and play. Also "immorality is in the streets, now in the broad places and lieth in wait at every corner." (Prov. vii, 12.) On the one hand men and women are forced to live in homes which, because of the congestion, are like hovels. Loss of honor and self-respect are not unknown guests. Lack of leisure prevents the pursuit of self-culture through study and reflection. At the same time we find the records of such wonderful heroism in the battle for truth, honor and righteousness as to excite the admiration

of all. Here we are introduced to men and women who know what it means to make sacrifices, who know how to toil faithfully and die heroically.

The road through the East Side proved to be a short road in my investigation, for it led to a scene of such diversified interests, such far reaching influences, such different customs and ideas, such an endless array of institutions, as fairly to reflect the world-wide Jewish problem. The East Side forms a unique community, most wonderfully organized in all that concerns the welfare of Israel, in spite of the seeming disorganization and disintegration; most peaceful, happy and self-reliant in spite of the seeming conflicting purposes, the squalid homes, and the helplessness of the people; a community thoroughly Jewish and thoroughly American, without the slightest hint of any possible incompatibility.

But the very vastness of the problem, though concentrated in a narrow area, made my road a very long and tortuous one in the end. A commission of experts, thoroughly familiar with the whole industrial problem, could hardly expect without undivided attention for many months, to cover the whole field of industrial conditions among the Jews. In the first place, there is no census of Jewish working people in this country. Workingmen are not enumerated according to their religion. The unions, in which this fact would be readily ascertainable, comprise only a comparatively small number of the workingmen. (Out of about twenty millions of working people, only three millions are affiliated with the unions in the United States.) The Jewish workingmen are, as a rule, not organized as such, preferring to enlist in the National or State bodies on nonreligious lines.

The difficulty of determining the limitations of the subject soon presented itself, for it was found that men who might properly be recorded as workingmen one day would be raised from a low estate and transformed over night into merchant princes and great manufacturers. Because it was impossible to differentiate between the body of permanent workers and the

larger body of workers, many of whom are in the transitional stage of preparation for positions as merchants and professional men, it seemed best to follow a good old Jewish practice of leaving indefinite what can not be defined.

The study of the Jewish workingman disclosed the further fact that the workingmen are almost exclusively recruited from the recent immigrants, for with an almost negligible exception, it is stated that the Jewish immigrants of a past generation are themselves employers of labor, a fact which is not a fruitless cause of much bitterness on the part of the employe, who in the native town in Russia was recognized as far superior to the man who, by the change of fortune, is the employer in America.

It was a matter of both practical and philosophic perplexity to determine to what extent our people were affiliated with the Synagogue, as well as to establish a standard to measure the degree of religiosity of our people. The records of Synagogue affiliation in this country, as compiled by official and private statisticians, as will be shown, are imperfect, and largely underestimate the actual number of Synagogue supporters. But still this does not measure Jewish loyalty. The old command, "Do not separate yourself from the congregation" (Aboth) (*Al tifrosh min hazibur*) has been interpreted by some of our people as applying to the *community of Israel*, a command which the fewest will not scrupulously obey. Orthodoxy is not the final test, Reform is not the last standard, Zionism is not the criterion of Jewish loyalty. Let the partisans of these movements in Israel shout themselves hoarse, let them hurl at each other imprecation and proscription to their heart's content; let them misunderstand and misrepresent one another as they choose; it will still be true that the Jewish people and the people alone will be the final arbiters of their religion. And this peculiar people has shown itself in possession of a heart and soul great and good enough to say to everyone who subscribes himself by the name of Israel, "Come and nestle close to my bosom."

This view is re-enforced, moreover, by the observation that *from the religious standpoint*, there is very little, in fact, there is nothing to differentiate the workingman from the employer. The Synagogue knows no laborer nor the employer of labor as such. It holds all men equal. The rich and the poor all form a brotherhood. Leviticus (xix-15), has proclaimed to the Synagogue its duty: "Thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honor the person of the great." Simeon of Sichnin, the digger of wells, was adjudged as important to the community as Jochanan ben Zakkai the scholar. (Midrash to Koheleth iv, 17.)

The Rabbis have emphasized that the terms, *Yisroel* "Israel," and *Adam* "man," being never used in the plural are significant as teaching the unity of all men. Phillips Brooks echoed this thought when he said, "I like workingmen very much, and care for their good, but I have nothing distinct or separate to say to them about religion; nor do I see how it will do any good to treat them as a separate class in this matter, in which their needs and duties are just like other men's."

It is the glory of religion that it lifts the individual out of his narrow isolation to see himself as a member of the human family. It is the glory of religion that it ignores the national variations, the social disagreements, the industrial differences which divide men and nations into groups, and speaks in behalf of humanity, to plead in the name of truth for the eternal welfare of mankind. So it will be found that the same causes that operate to make the workingman indifferent to the Synagogue will apply to the employers of labor.

And yet the Synagogue in directing men to a consideration of the world problem, and stimulating them with the hope of the attainment of justice and righteousness, can not afford to dissociate itself from the local problems nor ignore the present injustice, social and economic.

In attempting to define the attitude of the modern Synagogue to the workingman, the writer has labored under the difficulty which confronts the timorous pioneer. There is no treatise on

the subject from the Jewish point of view. Information had to be gathered from interviews with working people and labor leaders, from discussions with social workers, from pamphlets on various phases of the subjects, from newspaper reports and articles, and personal observation.

Under such circumstances it can not be expected that one shall be able to do more than open the subject for discussion. With such limitation, however, one is comforted by the words of Rabbi Tarphon, "It is not thy duty to complete the work, but neither art thou free to desist from it." *Lo 'olecho ligmor welo attoh ben horin lehibbotel mimmenu.* (Aboth ii, 21.)

But the workingmen themselves now knock at our doors. Let us open to them and bid them enter in the name of the Lord. Let us question them as to the reasons which have estranged many of them from the Synagogue. (For brief statements on the general conditions prevailing among our working people and their families, see Appendices on (a) Occupations; (b) Trades Unionism; (c) Disease; (d) Criminality; (e) Standard of Living; (f) Amusements; (g) Politics, and (h) Religion.)

Estrangement from the Synagogue.

Influence of the Christian fellow-workman.

Living as we do in a Christian environment, it is not possible without the highest degree of intelligence, most careful watchfulness and the staunchest loyalty, to avoid the influences of the press, stage, and platform so universally the vehicles of Christian ideas and principles. How can it be expected that the Jewish workman would remain impervious to the impressions which he is constantly receiving of Christian ideas when it is remembered that the day of rest recognized by law, the annual festivals on which cessation from labor is enjoined, are Christian holidays? Besides, the children of Jewish parents are frequently asked to join in the singing of Christian hymns, to recite Christian prayers, to hear the expression of Christian sentiments, in the public schools. The literature of the day, with the ex-

ception of the important books of science, art and philosophy, is largely of the religious views, directly or implied, of our neighbors. It is not easy to remain a loyal Jew when one stands alone and isolated in an environment not entirely sympathetic.

The influence of the environment is no doubt to be reckoned with in determining the attitude of the Jews to the Synagogue. What obtains in the Church, to a degree, will be reflected in the Synagogue.

The interdenominational strife among the Christian Churches has estranged many of the Christian workingmen. It has begun to appear unseemly that the various churches instead of working in harmony for the welfare of humanity are continually clashing in their interests, each one seeking to advance its own denominational interest. The working people are thinking that if the various churches would unite their forces, they would be able materially to help mitigate the evils of the industrial world. Because they are not at peace, the churches fail to appeal to many working people who so greatly feel the need of peace.

Then again the churches today insist on putting the question, "Do you believe? That staggers any broadminded man who feels that what he believes is of little consequence compared with what he lives." (Stelzle, *Workingman and Social Problems*, p. 102.) Working people have become class-conscious and recognize their part in our industrial progress, and not receiving their just share of the profits, as they feel, they consider that the professions of a faith which has not helped them, and the anticipations of a future world which totally ignore the actual state of things here and now, are senseless and valueless promptings of the imagination.

The unbending and fixed character of the Christian Church is responsible also for the defection of many people. Its claim to have spoken the final words on every phase of truth, which are registered in its creeds and ceremonies, is being analyzed by thinking men today with the result that the creeds and institutions are subjected to such severe attacks and sweeping

denials as to indicate impending disaster. In the meantime, the doubts and fears of the people are marked by their *indifference*, if not positive *disloyalty*, to the church.

The people, too, are not ignorant of the inconsistency of many churches which, as corporations, own unsanitary tenements and exact exorbitant rents. Yet these strongholds of the faith resound with denunciations against these very evils. The people, moreover, are not unconscious of the extent to which members of the churches offend against justice and morality in the conduct of their business in evading the laws framed to protect the poor and helpless. Then again, the Church wastes its energy in the solution of secondary problems, such as:

Total abstinence.

Closing of public places on Sunday, art galleries, recreation centers, etc.

Amusement on Sunday.

Small wonder that the people lose patience with the Church, which aims so often to deny the workingman the only pleasure possible for him by an open Sunday. At the same time the workingman can not fail to notice the opening of golf clubs in the country, the automobile trips, etc., etc., which are attractions to the rich, Sunday after Sunday, with scarcely a word of condemnation from the churches. It is impossible for the people not to get the impression that the churches are more interested practically in the welfare of the rich than in that of the poor.

Then again, the working people have concluded that the evils which they suffer in the industrial world could in a moment be removed if the captains of industry were disposed to treat them justly, to give them a more equitable share of the profits of their labor. But these same captains of industry, week after week in their various churches, give expression to their belief in the brotherhood of man, and pray that God's blessings shall rest upon His children. Yet these same men nullify in their conduct on the market place and in the factory, the teachings of the religion which theoretically recognizes

neither rich nor poor. Since the churches are so largely maintained by the rich, who are regarded by the workingmen as their oppressors, they can not be induced to identify themselves with the rich man's institutions. This attitude of the workingmen is well described in a statement of one of them, "How can we pray with him on Sunday when he preys upon us during the week?" (Workingman and the Social Problem, by Stelzle, p. 95.)

Although the Synagogue is free from strife that rages in the Church, for not even the differences between the various wings of Judaism rest upon a more solid foundation than social, temperamental or accidental causes; although the Synagogue lays less stress upon belief than upon practice expressed in ceremonials, which are regarded at best as valuable shields, or fences to the laws; although the Synagogue has shown itself wonderfully adaptable to the needs of every age; although the Synagogue has never wasted its energy on the solution of problems which its devotees could better handle by themselves; although the Synagogue never assuming that it has brought all the good to mankind, does not hold itself responsible for the evil, it happens, nevertheless, that many of our people under the influence of the environment, having little knowledge of their own religion, imagine that the same conditions that prevail in the Church are duplicated in the Synagogue. They think that the criticisms which are leveled at the Church apply also to the Synagogue, and they acquire the easy habit of antagonism toward the Synagogue. It is not to be denied that to a certain extent some Synagogues are amenable to the same criticism that is aimed at the Christian Church, but wherever the causes of indifference as indicated above apply, the determining factor in their origin and continuance is the influence of the Christian environment.

The Synagogue itself, however, has been responsible for the indifference of some of our people to Judaism. In a number of instances it has refused to permit the Rabbi to serve the Jewish people unless they were affiliated with a Synagogue.

Rabbis have been known to refuse to officiate at a funeral or marriage service where the parties had not been, or the members of their families would not be, identified with the Synagogue, unless a special payment be made to the congregation. It is true that anyone who is able, in refraining from supporting a Synagogue, offends against a primary duty to his people, but it is a policy shortsighted and weak which would restrict such a one to the benefits of Judaism at a time when he *does* feel the influence of his faith. It is not to be denied that the burden is harder upon the faithful, but the open door policy is the only one most likely to succeed in finally winning to the support of the Synagogue all our people. At any rate, the "closed door" has had influence upon many to confirm their indifference to the Synagogue.

The tragedy which is being enacted in many Jewish homes is a fruitful cause of estrangement from the Synagogue. In the New World, the children have become impatient with certain of the religious ceremonies of their parents, and the many attractions of the new life make rather irksome the old duty which each child was required to perform, to study the Torah. The parents find it difficult to exact obedience and reverence from their children. Many children of the immigrants have become ashamed of their own parents and their ways of life. This sad condition of the house divided against itself is sufficient to account for the temporary indifference of many of the rising generation to the duties imposed by religion.

Another potent cause of indifference to the Synagogue on the part of many of our immigrants is the radical difference between the Synagogue in America and the Synagogue as established in the old country. I refer now simply to the external arrangements. Dr. Blaustein, speaking of Jews in Russia before emigration, has said that the "entire life of the Jews, intellectual, social and even commercial, centers around their religion and around the Synagogue—the seat of religion. In addition to being the house of worship, the Synagogue is to them the school, the lecture hall, the club, the political arena, and even the

produce exchange. The Synagogue is furthermore the only place where Jews can apply and utilize their talent. . . . In other words, having no opportunities outside the pale of Jewish settlement, the Jew must confine himself to the limited circle of his own people. The old Jews still use ancient Hebrew as their literary language. All books, be they religious or secular, are written in Hebrew; newspapers, daily and weekly, are published in Hebrew, and business correspondence is likewise carried on in Hebrew." (University Settlement Studies, July, 1905, p. 75.) From such a condition our people have come to an environment in which the Synagogue has been divorced practically from every phase of Jewish life except purely the religious worship. Outside the precinct of the Synagogue flourish the Jewish societies, clubs, guilds; the newspapers and periodicals are not under the direction and supervision of the Rabbis; groups of Jews from various cities are independently organized, sometimes as rival institutions; indeed, a seemingly disorganized mass without head or tail, which is sufficient to shake the confidence in the Synagogue of many of those who had looked to it as to a supreme seat of authority in all things that concerned the Jewish people.

It is no doubt true that some of the working people are not drawn to the Synagogue because it is almost wholly under the control of the wealthy classes. If profession is to be balanced by practice, the working people fail to understand why they are excluded from the Board of Directors of the Synagogues with which they are expected to affiliate. Very few of the Boards of Directors of our Synagogues, not excepting a well known organization which claims to be positively free in its championship of all kinds of policies, have a representative of the poorer classes as a member. If our democratic ideal will be logically applied, there is little doubt but that the working people will flock to the Synagogue, which shall welcome their representation.

The method of Synagogue support is also a bar to the participation of the poor in public worship. Our Synagogues charge

an exorbitant rate, comparatively speaking, for the ownership of pews. It is an expense hard to meet by our working people to associate themselves with many of our Synagogues. In their pride, they refrain from attending the service they are unable to support. It must not be overlooked, however, that there are numerous Synagogues among the working people themselves, which charge as low as two or three dollars a year for membership.

No doubt the most determining reason for the neglect of the Sabbath is the necessity which rests upon the vast majority of our workmen to labor on the six recognized working days in the week. It is simply impossible for more than a very insignificant number to secure such positions as will enable them to rest on the Sabbath. They are compelled to report for work on Saturday as on the other days of the week. On the subject the Chief Rabbi of England has said: "I believe that this disregard is due not so much to a relaxation of religious sentiment as to the fierce struggle for existence which now prevails, and the keen competition that pervades every walk of life." (*Jew in London*, p. 122.)

Because of their exhausted condition from a week of hard toil, the workers are frequently unable to enjoy the Sabbath in peace. "Even in those instances where there has been a cessation of work, how is the Sabbath kept? They that know the terribly long hours during which the presser and machinist, the cap maker and laster and factory workers have toiled during the week will readily forgive their keeping in bed till a late hour on the Sabbath morn." (*Jewish Chronicle*, January 5, 1906.) And so accustomed do they become to absence from the Synagogue, that they soon lose the habit of attending service, and in their helpless condition grow up in ignorance of all that makes life worth living.

Many workmen are estranged from the Synagogue because the strict orthodox wing of Judaism no longer appeals to them, for it overemphasises the ceremonial and officially endorses ideas which are positively no longer accepted by the people at large,

such as the "Resurrection of the dead," the Bible as the literal word of God, the inferior position of woman, etc., etc. The Reform wing of Judaism has not yet won large numbers of our working people because Reform is not known by our workmen. This is due, to the greatest extent, to the misrepresentation, the unjust criticism, the passionate denunciation, which it has suffered at the hands of those who wilfully and ignorantly condemn it. In a spirit of blind partisanship, many so-called orthodox Jews permit themselves the most unbridled license in their characterization of Reform Judaism. With oratorical flourishes, which are successful in their appeal according to the measure of passion exhibited by the speaker, many leaders and preachers misrepresent it to our working people and foster the spirit of group prejudice and hatred. Certain Jewish papers pour out column after column of misrepresentation of our cause. It is worthy of note that the editor of one of the leading Eastern Jewish papers, upon receiving a signed letter protesting against certain unfair and misleading representations against the Hebrew Union College, at the very moment that the Eastern Jewish public was receiving only one side of a bitter controversy, wrote as follows: "To my very great regret I find myself unable to print the accompanying [letter], interesting as it is, and putting most forcibly a view which has not been adequately presented. But it comes rather late, the interest in the matter having somewhat waned, and for personal reasons I have not given much space to the controversy, since it would be rather unsuitable for a person so closely connected as I am with the Seminary to seem to interfere in the affairs of the Hebrew Union College."

And again, very recently some prominence was given in one of our Jewish periodicals to a scurrilous article on the Reform Jew. Subsequently, the writer said: "I believe then that if I should be writing the article now, I should criticise the German and Reform Jew much less severely, and I should be less optimistic as to the Russian Jew. . . . I shall, however, study up the subject at the first opportunity; and if I find

anything worth saying on the other side, I shall say it in print." Just think of the absurdity of the situation! A man doing a responsible work in a community permitting himself to deliver a philippic against a movement before he takes the opportunity to study it! Can we wonder that our Russian brethren entertain the most absurd notions of our position, are distrustful of our loyalty to Judaism, are unacquainted with our eager concern for the welfare of our brethren all over the world?

Although we have considered the alleged causes of indifference to the Synagogue on the part of many Jews, we can not begin to analyze the extent of the devotion of the people at large. To the institution they might have objection based upon a fancied or real grievance, but against Judaism the very fewest will rebel. It is impossible to measure the loyalty of a people to their faith by the standard of attendance at Synagogue. "God says to Israel: I bade thee read thy prayers unto me in thy Synagogues; but if thou canst not, pray in thy house; and if thou art unable to do this, pray when thou art in thy field; and if this be inconvenient to thee, pray on thy bed; and if thou canst not do even this, think of me in thy heart." ("Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology," by Schechter, p. 156.) Workmen were, moreover, permitted to recite the Shema while in a tree or upon a wall if they were engaged in their labor; they were not compelled to descend to the ground or to go to the Synagogue. (Ber. ii, 4.) If one should be riding on a donkey, and could not conveniently dismount to recite the Shema, he was permitted to turn his face toward the Sanctuary and recite it. And in the event of his being unable even to turn himself to the Sanctuary, it was permitted him to direct his heart to it, and it was accounted as fulfilling his duty. (Ber. iv, 5.) The law permitted one who happened to be on a ship, or a wagon or upon a raft to direct his thoughts to God, and it was sufficient. (Ber. iv, 6.)

Even with the regular ritual, much leniency was permitted under stress of necessity. With reference to the *Mussaph* Prayer the sages reversed the opinion of Rabbi Eleazar ben Aza-

riah, who said that the *Mussaph* must be recited in the Synagogue, by stating that it might be recited without, as well as within, the Synagogue. Indeed, Rabbi Jehuda held that if the *Mussaph* were recited in the Synagogue, the individual was free from reciting it altogether.

Judged by such standards which are reasonable, it becomes impossible for us to say to what extent our working people are religious or irreligious. There is no method by which we can register the amount of a man's devotion to God, his love of Israel. While at his task, the ordinary workman may pray more devoutly to God than the most faithful of Synagogue attendants. With every stroke of the hammer, he might gather strength and determination to split sin and corruption to fragments. With every stitch of the machine, the worker may fashion in his imagination a garment of such rare intellectual and spiritual beauty as to be fit to clothe a poet. Who can tell how many of the working people unable to attend the Synagogue during the week as well as on the Sabbath, never fail to offer their prayers to God morning, noon and night, and make the earnest effort to live in accordance with the laws of Israel. Many doubtless fail; but the dark pictures of the religious life of the poor, painted by many investigators, are more than checked and offset by the bright scenes depicted by others. It is a phase of the subject impossible of analysis without a house to house, indeed, person to person, canvass, conducted not by paid agents, but by trustworthy friends of the poor, and covering a period of years. The hasty generalizations so freely offered as to the religious condition of the poor "are not a description of the state of the slums. They are only a dark and dreadful description of the state of the slummers."

Those who are students of the subject know how great an influence the Jewish religion exercises upon the Jewish people. In their heart of hearts they love its beautiful and noble ideas; they are attached to its poetic and appealing symbolism; they feel themselves a part of that sweeping current of God's holy spirit coursing through the centuries, causing hope to revive

in the desolate heart, peace to thrive in barren places, and making "the desert rejoice and blossom as the rose."

Because it is impossible, utterly impossible, for us to estimate with any degree of precision the undoubted loyalty to Judaism of the vast majority of our people, and because formal attachment to the Synagogue has never been established as the final test of a Jew's devotion to his faith, must we be ever on our guard to resent to the bitter end the false accusations made by the press and on the platform of our day.

The "muckrakers" in our own midst are doing us an injury by going up and down the land proclaiming that the Synagogue is doomed because it muzzles its Rabbis, gets its support in ways unaesthetic and commercial. Wild statements are made about the intolerable conditions that surround the Jewish pulpit, necessitating, as it was claimed, the withdrawal in the course of a year of a number of prominent Rabbis who in self-respect would have to give up their posts of duty. When these statements are subjected to the keen analysis of perfect truth, we are forced to the conclusion that they are half-cooked preparations of oratorical mush. The "legitimate" Synagogue has not been guilty of raising insignificant matters of practical administration to issues of philosophic import. Is a case made against the Synagogue which does succeed in spite of tremendous obstacles in holding our people true to the Sabbath and Holy Days, when critics of the Synagogue surrender the Sabbath, change the Holy Days and boast of an emancipation, which is nothing but unbridled and reckless license? Do the people actually muzzle their Rabbi when they plead with him to give them spiritual food that falls from heaven, instead of the chaff which every noisy convention blows his way? Is it a sign of progress to have all kinds of contradictory ideas presented in the same pulpit, instead of a consistent, well-developed philosophy to which the Rabbi stands pledged and which he is ready to defend?

We do not want to be understood as crying "peace, peace," when there is much need of correcting certain temporary de-

fects of our modern Jewish life, but at the same time we are sure that many who come in the name of the Lord are nothing more than false prophets.

"Even the unrest apparent in many quarters is a healthier sign than the spiritual stagnation of a generation back. In the past, when communal life was more compact and Jews were solely dependent on each other for social intercourse, a mechanical conformity was preserved without there necessarily being any sense of conviction. That censorship which one Jew exercised over another has become impossible, and he has now to be guided in his religious observance by conviction rather than by the dictation of others. This is a much healthier state of things, and although it involves more heterodoxy, it is calculated to produce worthier religious life." (H. S. Lewis, "Jew in London," p. 235-f.)

One of the clearest indications of the strength of the Jewish religion among the working people is the absolute failure of the missionaries, who work on so elaborate a scale to convert our men, women and children to Christianity. From all reports of these movements, that come to us through the secular and religious press, it is gratifying to learn that our people, with an almost negligible exception, are unalterably loyal to the faith of our fathers. From a Christian source, the following statement is noteworthy: "So far from the problem of the effective evangelization of these Jewish millions having been solved, it is to be feared that the magnitude of the undertaking has not even yet been realized." (Jewish Chronicle, October 2, 1908. Report of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Among Jews.)

The Strength of the Synagogue.

It is well nigh impossible at the present time to give an accurate number of Synagogues and members of Synagogues in the United States. In a recent report issued by the United States Government, it was stated that the total number of

Synagogues in the United States in 1906 was 1769, with a membership of 101,457 heads of families. But this figure is too small according to the records of the Jewish Publication Society, which had enumerated up to 1906 nearly one hundred more Synagogues. From the reports of the Society I have counted as many as 2,114 Synagogues in the United States. 1,169 of these Synagogues, consisting of large and small congregations in the great as well as in the small towns, give a membership of over 100,640 members, or an average of 86 members to a congregation. At this rate, the other 945 congregations would aggregate a membership of 81,270, or a grand total of 181,910 members. If every member on the average is the head of a family representing three persons, we have a population of 545,730, under the guidance of the Synagogue. These figures tell only part of the story, for the statistics exact as far as they go, are not complete, as my study of Newark conditions reveals. The Year Books of the Publication Society record twelve congregations for Newark, with a membership of 1,069, while I have found twenty congregations with membership of more than 1,800 persons. This number is not large enough to cover the many smaller congregations which flourish in the various Talmud Torah halls, in private houses and lodges. Assuming that this condition is duplicated in the country at large, attachment of our people to the Synagogue is by far more extensive than we had imagined. With a Jewish population of 1,777,185 in the United States, as it is estimated, by whom 2,114 Synagogues are supported, we find that there is on the average one Synagogue for every 840 Jews. This does not include the many Synagogues that are not recorded, but of whose existence there is little doubt. At the same time, it must be noted that some of the Synagogues included in my computation are open for services only on the High Holidays. The affiliation of Jews with the Synagogues in the country at large is on the whole not unsatisfactory, and by far not as bad as some of our friends, as well as our foes, would have us believe.

Even in New York City conditions are not, can not be, as

bad as pictured. The Year Books report something like 563 Synagogues in Greater New York. 259 of these Synagogues in 1906 reported a membership of 26,804 persons, or 103 persons to a Synagogue. At this rate Jewry in New York is 58,607 strong as far as membership in Synagogues is concerned. This is really a conservative estimate. Now, allowing that each member represents three persons at least, we have a total of 175,821 Jews under the influence of the Synagogue. Estimating the Jewish population of New York City at 750,000 persons, we have 20.9 percentage of Jews belonging to congregations. Remembering that there are innumerable halls and homes which are regularly thrown into Synagogues on the Sabbath and Holy Days, we might expect to find the estimate above referred to considerable increased.

In the light of these facts, we have the right to question the rather startling announcements made by Dr. Walter A. Laidlaw and others as to the loyalty of Jews to the Synagogue, in his "Study of the Jews of New York as Observed in Ten Years' Investigation." But until we know how the statistics were compiled, we can not but doubt their accuracy, especially in view of the statement made by Dr. Laidlaw himself in 1905: "In that whole section of Manhattan, south of 14th Street, east of Broadway, there are more Synagogues than there are Protestant Churches in the whole Island. . . . There are, to my knowledge, less than 350 Protestant Churches on Manhattan Island." (Amer. Heb., May 19, 1905.) Is not this an exceptionally good showing for our people, who form less than one-third the general population of New York City?

What Synagogue Does.

The most convincing appeal which the Synagogue can make to the working people for their allegiance and support is a record of its labor in their behalf. It is often overlooked even by those who represent the Synagogue, that it is the influence of the Synagogue, directly or indirectly, that is gradually improving the lot of the working people.

In the first place, the very ideals which have become the property of the masses were conceived, formulated and promulgated by the Synagogue. As the people today agitate and labor for more equitable conditions, better standards of justice, they do not know, or will not admit, that it is due to the success which has attended the efforts of the Synagogue in spreading its teachings broadcast that they cherish these ideas at all. The ideas of justice, righteousness and charity were formulated by the prophets, it is true; but they have been preserved by the Rabbis in the Synagogues of Israel all through the ages.

It is, moreover directly traceable to the influence of the Synagogue that so many institutions of every description devoted to the amelioration of the poor, are founded and supported in our day. A merely cursory glance over the list of contributors to our various charitable and educational institutions in any community will reveal a very noteworthy fact, that the very largest percentage of the supporters are identified with the Synagogue. In large cities where a large percentage of Jews are not affiliated directly with the Synagogue, it is observable that only a small percentage of contributors to our institutions is found outside of the Synagogue. These institutions with scarcely an exception are devoted to the work of improving the general conditions of our people through hospitals, nurseries, asylums, relief societies, educational institutions, social centers, religious classes and houses of worship, all of which in all our cities are most largely supported by men and women connected with the Synagogue. To the credit of the Synagogue, in all fairness, must be recorded the great work done largely for the poor, by these many institutions.

What is true of the institutions applies to the men and women doing the work that is telling in its influence for good upon the lives of our poor. The consecration which the Synagogue gave them, the inspiration to a life of service imparted to them in its name, have aroused devoted servants of the people to go forth and labor for their welfare. Very few, indeed, are

they who are eyes to the blind and feet to the lame, who have not been inspired to their work by the religious spirit.

On many occasions, too, the Rabbis have raised their voices in defense of the workingman; they have served on arbitration committees, championed their cause and brought about settlements between them and their employers.

It is time for the Synagogue, especially when put on the defensive, as in our day, to speak out clearly as to its unremitting toil in behalf of the poor, its unswerving fidelity to the cause of justice, its courageous stand in the presence of the powerful and mighty to plead for peace and righteousness.

Let not the Synagogue in appealing to the masses for their support, pamper and patronize them by a false confession of its weakness. The Synagogue need not apologize to the Jewish people, for it has never forsaken them. The Synagogue need not change any of its fundamental pronouncements in order to please any class in modern Jewry, for it has never failed to represent all members of the household of Israel at all times. Here and there abuses may have flourished, disregard of the unity and peace of the whole community go unchecked, but these were individual outbreaks of men connected with, not the official expression of, the Synagogue. And while the institution largely reflects the individuals that compose it, the recognition of their ultimate independence in Jewry has enabled the Synagogue, to a marked degree, to keep free from the compromises and changes which characterize the growth of the Christian Church. The Synagogue need not admit to the Jewish workingman today that he has been neglected by it. On the contrary, the Synagogue can with full justice demand an explanation from the workingman for his indifference to its honor and welfare. The Synagogue has reason to resent to the point of defiance, the insinuations of some of its representatives that in its teachings the cause of justice to all classes and conditions of men has not been safeguarded. They are the false prophets who read the book of God's secrets by the glare of the street lamp, in the blaze of the banquet hall and the public place

instead of by the subdued, steady and soft gleam of the holy incense of the Sanctuary.

Besides, the Synagogue in its sanity and poise is not prepared to say that present conditions in every sphere of life are worse than former days. It has never said that the former days are better than these days. On the contrary, it is not unlikely that if the Synagogue felt it necessary to speak at all, in no uncertain terms, it would be prepared to say and to prove that these days are far better than the former days when slavery flourished, when the poor were sold for debt, when man's toil was unrelieved by the help of machines, when his leisure was fearfully circumscribed by his environment, out of touch with the centers of learning, distant from his fellows, all in all a life without the charms of our enlightened times. And as for abuses and outrages, exploitation and deception, the ancient days can reveal to us a more harrowing scene than our imagination can conjure up. But let us not raise the curtain upon the evils of the past. We surely have enough of them in our day. And to their solution the Synagogue, as well as the Church, must devote its full strength and most earnest service. But the Synagogue in working for the Kingdom of Heaven on earth will not assume that the Kingdom of Heaven has already arrived. It keeps ever in mind that men may hasten or hinder its coming according as they obey God's laws. But here and now men are not angelic; they manifest traits which merit God's disfavor. It can not, therefore, hold itself responsible for evil conditions which are inherent in the social body. If these evils were not here, there would be no need of Synagogue and Church to correct them.

The attitude of the Synagogue has been unequivocally friendly to the workers. In fact, the Synagogue has not looked upon them as a separate class whatsoever. The employers have not been more welcome than the laborers; in all ages the Synagogue has regarded them as equal before God, and has defended and protected the one as readily as the other. The Rabbis point out how God Himself is pictured as a workman who with a

divine plan and with infinite wisdom creates a world in which everything is beautiful and good. The Bible is replete with illustrations drawn from the life of workingmen. On almost every page the place of the workman "who goes forth to his labor until the evening" is idealized. The Fourth Commandment with its wise injunction to man to rest is really an exaltation of labor which is crowned by Sabbath rest.

"Hate not toilsome labor, nor husbandry which the Most High has created." (Eccles. vii, 16.)

Saul was taken from the plow to become the first king in Israel. David was summoned from the field where he had tended the sheep to assume the responsibility of ruler in Israel.

"In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." (Gen. iii, 19.) The word *'ebed* servant applied to prophets in Israel was the designation of the workman also.

"Sleep of a laboring man is sweet, whether he eat little or much; but the abundance of the rich will not suffer him to sleep." (Eccles. 5, 12.)

RABBINICAL.

Importance of Work.—"Man can not be brought under the yoke of work too soon." (Midrash Echa, chap. iii.)

"Every father must instruct his son in some kind of occupation." (Berachoth, 65.)

"A parent who fails to teach his son a trade teaches him to steal." (Kiddushin, 29.)

"Four things should become a habit to man and practiced regularly: the study of God's word, charity, piety and work." (Berachoth, 32.)

"Because of the importance of work, idleness is assigned by the Rabbis as the cause of death, and the loss of Paradise." (Mid. to Gen. ii, chap. 17.)

Dignity of Work.—"No man shall say, I am too high for this or that work: I am the son of a great man or the offspring of a noble family." (Aboth de R. N., chap. xi.)

"God has arranged that each individual should find his work agreeable and prefer it to any other work, no matter how burdensome." (Berachoth, 43b.)

"An honest workingman stands higher than a man of noble birth." (Mid. to Gen., chap. xxiii.)

"Flay a carcass on the street, and say not, I am a priest, or a great man. Any kind of work is more honorable than idleness and being supported by others." (B. B., 110a.)

Work Superior to Prayer.—"One is not allowed to say, 'I shall pray and worship continually and God will provide for me all that I need.'" (Tanchuma to Gen. xxxi.)

"He is a pious man who expects least of God and does most for himself." (Mid. Tehillim, chap. lxxix.)

"An excellent thing is the study of the Torah combined with some worldly occupation, for the labor demanded by them both makes sin to be forgotten. All study of the Torah without work must in the end be futile and become the cause of sin." (Aboth ii, 2 Singer's Translation.)

Justice to Laborer.—"The agreement between employer and employee must specify as to the kind of work, the time of its beginning, and the compensation for it." (B. M., 83a.)

"The laborer is not to be compelled to do such work that might impair his health." (B. M., 77a.)

"No laborer could be compelled to work overtime even though the master permitted him special pay." (B. M., 83a.)

"Laborer could bring suit if he failed to receive his hire within twelve hours after his pay became due." (B. M., 3a.)

"Employer who failed to make all the necessary provisions for the safety and welfare of his employees was held responsible by the law." (B. K., 33a.)

In practice, too, the Rabbis indicated their appreciation of the honor of labor. The early teachers in Israel did not receive a compensation. They earned their livelihood in the trades and professions of their day as did the people at large. Rabbi Joseph turned a mill; Rabbi Chanina was a shoemaker; Rabbi Abba was a tailor; Abba Saul was a gravedigger; Jose a leather-

dresser; Jochanan was a sandal-maker; Simeon an embroiderer; Nehemiah a potter; Abba Oshaja a dyer; Abin a carpenter; Joshua ben Chananja a clasp-maker; Joshua ben Illai a cooper by trade, et al.

What the Synagogue can do.

Because of its friendliness to both parties, the Synagogue in its official capacity can do little, and should attempt to do little, directly to champion the interests of the workingman against the employer. Indeed, it is clear that whatever affects one class surely affects the other. The Synagogue knows no laborer, recognizes no employer; in its sacred precincts, to all workers, be they rich or poor, native or foreign born, one law applies, and that law the strict law of justice.

If the Synagogue in its official capacity were to turn to champion the cause of the laboring man against his employer, simply by reason of its inability to speak with authority on any subject outside of religion, it would be not at all unlikely that a temporary victory gained by the Synagogue would become ultimately of grave peril and danger to the interests of the very class it had sought to help. It is impossible for the Synagogue to master the necessary details of a great economic problem to warrant the attempt to solve it. The problem did not grow over night, nor will be untangled in a day. The Synagogue will do sufficient towards its final settlement when it thunders in the presence of both classes who are equally dear, that there are rules which must be obeyed by both parties as they enter the contest. The Synagogue must stand near to insist as far as possible that the rules of the contest, justice, righteousness, and kindness shall not be ignored by either party.

It is a noteworthy fact that the Christian Church which, with a laudable zeal and devoted interest, has set to herself nothing short of the task of solving this vexing problem, has actually done little else than appoint committees, delegate rep-

representatives to the labor unions and formulate plans of attack. A great agitation on the subject in pulpit, press and platform has aroused the public almost to the conclusion that the labor problem is solved, whereas, it has just begun to be recognized at all. And we are as far from a solution of it as we are distant from the Messianic Era. The Church as a Church has not recorded a single triumph of consequence in its work among the wage earners. Preaching in factories, sitting in labor conventions, signing petitions of industrial reforms, agitating for sanitary factories, protected machinery, better housing conditions, and the like, the ministers of the various denominations have been instrumental in effecting many needed improvements. But mark you! The work they have done and are doing, strictly speaking, is not denominational. Presbyterianism, as such, has not advanced because one of the active workers in the field of labor happens to be a member of that church. Episcopalianism, as such, has not profited as a church because it has added to its church activities a labor bureau. A well-known worker has said, "There have been various efforts on the part of the Churches here in New England to identify themselves with labor movements, or rather with the labor people, but I do not believe that they have made any substantial progress."—Edward T. Hartman.

It is true, the inspiration to the work of industrial reform was imparted by the Synagogue or the Church either directly or indirectly, not as pledged to this or that particular reform or in advocacy of the cause of either party in the industrial conflict, but simply through the emphasis and interpretation of the old principles of justice and righteousness which change not, though conditions in which they are to be applied continually change. The inspiration to the work came from the religious institution, but the actual work is to be credited to the individuals who labored, not directly as churchmen, but as men.

If the church undertakes as a church to speak with authority upon any phase of the labor problem, it will not only fail, but endanger its very existence. In the first place, it can not make

any one of life's many interests and activities its chief concern, nor, again, has it the training for leadership in the direct field of labor, it can not afford to lose for one instant the guardianship of the very highest and most inclusive influence of life, the religious consciousness; nor can the Church without harm to the future bring all its strength to bear upon the solution of a problem which at best is only a passing phase of the larger problem of life itself.

This attitude does not exclude consideration of modern problems in the Synagogue. We can not live in the world and not be influenced by the world. It is the duty of the Synagogue to grapple in a courageous spirit even with the mightiest of our modern giants, the Industrial Evil. This is the attitude assumed by a great teacher in Israel, who, though he takes an occasional fling at those who introduce questions of sociological import into their sermons, includes among *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology* a consideration of certain phases of the labor problem.

The Bible abounds in similes drawn from the life of an agricultural people. It will be the duty of the modern Synagogue to show that the teachings of Judaism as bearing on modern industrialism are clear and pertinent. Judaism with its perennial freshness and vigor has its message also for these days.

To make our teachings intelligible to our people, to impress them with the unchanging character of our God amidst an ever changing environment, it is our duty to speak in a language that our people understand, to draw illustrations and instances from the industrial life of our day. We need not busy ourselves to discover new ideas to replace the eternal principles of our faith; it is sufficient if, by apt illustration, we make the old ones intelligible to our people in an industrial age.

The experiment has been tried in Philadelphia, New York, Chicago and Cleveland to provide a free Synagogue for the people, and so successful has it proved to be that it seems most worthy of repetition. Ought not our wealthier Jews in our

various cities equip and maintain Synagogues for the people in the midst of the people?

It is questionable whether the plan of the Mikveh Israel Congregation of Philadelphia to open its old building to the poor for worship without any cost is altogether wise. The poorest Israelite would take a keener interest in the Synagogue if he were permitted, according to his ability to pay something towards its maintenance, even though the sum be insignificant. His sense of ownership or partnership in a Sanctuary of God ought to be aroused. Instead of gratitude to the rich congregation for the privilege of worship, he would feel it his right and duty by reason of his sacrifice to give it his attention. It is not altogether clear, moreover, whether it is the best policy to segregate the workingmen as such, although in ancient Alexandria it is reported that the various guilds had their separate sections in the Synagogue (Succa, 51).. The Philadelphia experiment should be watched with interest as to the effect of giving to our poor a Synagogue over which they shall have no control. It must be remembered that "while workingmen are poor, they are also proud, and they would be slow to connect themselves with an exclusive institution which might possibly be dubbed 'a poor man's church.'" (Stelzle, "Workingman and Social Problems," p. 144.)

If it is not possible for all of our congregations to open branch Synagogues for the poor in our cities, it may be practicable for them to devote the vestry rooms to additional services for the poor. It is worthy of careful study, also, how we might utilize our Synagogues for more than one service on Sabbaths in order that we might accommodate the working people. What would prevent our holding a very early morning service or an afternoon service for the benefit of our working people?

As of old, our greatest safeguard and bulwark of strength is our religious school. While our children recite with joy the principles of Judaism and learn with delight its laws and ceremonies, it will be impossible for evil to overtake us. For in the religious schools our children will imbibe those teachings

which will enable them to overcome temptations and keep far from them the spirit of evil which, according to the Rabbis, dare not cross the threshold of the school.

If we desire to perpetuate our faith, our most zealous labor, our greatest sacrifices must be given to the work of our schools. No matter how great the obstacles to a religious life in the industrial world may be, the proper religious training of the youth will most likely prove the most potent factor in overcoming them. In every city, the loyal men and women of Israel ought to stir themselves to build, equip and maintain religious schools not only for the children of those affiliated with the Synagogue but for children of the poor as well. Unless the poor receive this help from their brethren more fortunately placed, they will not be in a position to found schools of a higher standard and efficiency than the Chedarim which, while serving the needs of a past generation not altogether inadequately, are positively a hindrance and a detriment today.

As an example of what a community can do toward the religious instruction of the children of the poor, the Plaut Memorial Hebrew Free School, of Newark, N. J., might be cited. The school is supported by the Jewish community of Newark, regardless of congregational affiliation. Some nine hundred children receive instruction in Hebrew and Jewish history during the week. For over twenty years this school has been a center in the religious life of the Jewish people of the city. The personality and ability of the late Superintendent, Myer S. Hood, have been influences of great benefit to the children and grandchildren of the immigrants from Russia. His success lay in the wisdom which prompted him to choose as his assistants loyal Jews and Jewesses who had been instructed in the modern principles of pedagogy. His attitude was that a child need not be less a Jew because American, nor less American because a Jew.

The school was not a growth from within the Jewish section which has been benefited by it. The school was conceived, built and maintained by Jews outside the Pale of Jewish Settlement.

The trustees of the orthodox Synagogues did not "realize their duty and open their houses of worship to the young. . . . They do not understand conditions, or will not understand them," wrote Dr. Julius H. Greenstone with reference to similar conditions in New York City. "To expect them to come to the rescue, and to realize the danger in their policy, is time wasted, danger thrice threatening. . . .

"Anyone acquainted with conditions must admit that the future of American Judaism is with the generation now growing up on the East Side, and it is here that our rich and influential Jews must come to the rescue as liberally and magnanimously as they did when the economic question was most perplexing. Religion as well as cleanliness and fresh air must be forced upon the down-town Jew. . . . The permanent help must come from without; until that comes we can expect but little improvement in the religious status of the growing generation of our down-town Jewry." (American Hebrew, September 4, 1903, p. 503.)

It is now being admitted that all social work to be thoroughly satisfactory must be permeated with the spirit of religion, and the most helpful workers are those who are guided by religion. The charity organizations among our own people as well as among our neighbors are mechanical in their administration, unfeeling in their assistance to the needy, except when under the direction of workers who are filled with the joy of the religious consciousness. The settlements which are divorced from the guidance of religious men and women, are failing to reach the heart of the problem which they have been expected to solve because they touch only the superficial things of life. Men and women need something more than cold, formal ethics as motives to noble conduct. They require a sense of a "divine relationship," the submission to authority over and above themselves, a belief that humanity in its age-long experience and constant search for God has formulated better laws and devised better ceremonies to support those laws than any individual or set of individuals who trust to their own limited powers and experi-

ences as sufficient guides to eternal truth, can conceive. Therefore, our institutions which are conducted by men and women of a negative religious outlook, and administered without regard to the religious views of the people whom the institutions serve, are at best but makeshifts and compromises.

It is now the duty of the Synagogue, which is responsible in largest measure for the very existence of most of our Jewish institutions, and from which to the greatest degree the money for their maintenance is drawn, to arise and to claim her own. While she need not assume direct supervision over them, she has not only the right but the duty to dictate their policy, that they shall be conducted as Jewish institutions, reaffirming the principle that their leaders shall be loyal Israelites, so that the need of religion in the development of the individual and communal life of Jews shall be properly emphasized.

There is a great opportunity as well as grave responsibility resting upon the Rabbi in our day. As an individual he can perform in the name of the Synagogue a tremendous task of such importance as to be well nigh indescribable.

While the Synagogue can not be accommodated to the needs of the working people any more than to the wants of the employers of labor, the Rabbi as its messenger can bring to both classes the essential teachings of the Synagogue that bear upon the question of justice in the industrial world. The Rabbi as the representative of the Synagogue has the right to bring together for friendly discussion the representatives of capital and labor in order that by exchange of views each side may have greater regard for the justice of each other's attitude, and by mutual concession put themselves in the way of ultimate peace. The Rabbi is the logical person in our Jewish world to do most toward the improvement of the lot of the workingman. If he has thoroughly understood his function and has been jealous of the dignity and purpose of the Synagogue, he has surely won in whatever community he lives the respect of the employer and the confidence and esteem of the wage earner. This position of trust imposes upon him a great duty and offers him a

splendid advantage. As an individual he must keep himself thoroughly informed of conditions in the industrial world. From time to time he would do well to consult labor leaders, seek conferences with employers, visit among the workingmen, simply for the purpose of knowing men and learning the issues of the day. And when the outbreaks threaten, if he does not actually succeed in preventing them, he will be in a position to recommend methods of procedure and reforms in practice which will be beneficial to both classes.

While the Rabbi as an individual can do much to bring together the representatives of capital and labor, let him be careful not to attempt to do more than his knowledge of the claims of both parties in the conflict warrants. Unless the Rabbi happens to be an expert on industrial issues, let him be sure that he gets complete knowledge of all the principles involved lest his oratorical panaceas make him the laughing-stock of those who intelligently and earnestly struggle to bring peace among the forces of capital and labor.

If the great Moses was forced to confess that he could not bear alone the whole burden of the people of Israel (Ex. xviii), and chose out able leaders, must we not admit that we Rabbis can not hope to carry the whole burden of our people? All we can do is to keep alive the eternal principles, to promulgate the laws which enable the men of understanding and of wisdom, of counsel and strength, to apply them to the affairs of life. We should not do less, we can not hope to do more, than to point the way over which our people must pass if they love justice and seek it sincerely in the industrial world.

Success not infrequently attends the efforts of the Rabbi to influence the Jewish merchants in a city to allow their Jewish employees to be absent from business on the holy days. It is known that many merchants today not only fail to comply with the old law that commands every one to refrain from all business dealings on the holy days, but also refuse to permit their employees to enjoy the sanctity of the service and the rest on the holy days. By keeping this important matter in mind, and by

planning to do earnest and persistent work in behalf of the sanctification of Sabbath and holy days, the Rabbis may be able to persuade our merchants themselves to observe and to permit their employees to observe the religious feasts. Every Jew owes it to himself to take the opportunity to satisfy and develop his spiritual nature. No difficulty is ever found in accommodating ourselves to the rest enjoined by the State or by the religious festivals of our Christian neighbors. We owe it to our self-respect to do something for our own good in the name of God and Israel. Whenever the laws of justice are offended by employer or by employee the Rabbi again with courage and confidence should boldly challenge the wrongdoer and proclaim fearlessly "*Thou art the man.*"

Towards this end this Conference can be of great assistance as a representative body of Jewish teachers. Through its influence and direction the following recommendations, when properly endorsed and adopted, might prove to be effective agencies of the Synagogue in its relation to the labor problem:

RECOMMENDATIONS.

I.

There is a real need of a modern leader among our immigrant brethren. A very large element of the East Side is utterly without religious stimulus. "The Synagogues as at present conducted," writes one of the submerged, "do not attract them, yes, actually repel them. The influence of the Rabbis and 'Magiddim' is less than nil. . . . In all the great Ghetto of New York there is not one English speaking Rabbi to whom the young can look up and follow. There is not a solitary one in a position to satisfy that spiritual hunger which some of us know to exist. . . . Immortality awaits . . . the Rabbi who can see his life-work down here among the most intelligent, intense, serious and well-intentioned community in God's earth. The opportunity is here. Where's the man?" (American Heb., June 16, 1905, p. 68.) The situation de-

mands the foresight of a statesman and the self-sacrifice of a prophet. The gratitude of our people will be the reward, and a commending conscience the sure recompense for earnest work undertaken among the poor of our people who are exploited by friend almost as much as foe. It seems possible to provide for the right leader by recommending to the Union of American Hebrew Congregations the advisability of placing in this section a Rabbi who shall limit the sphere of his activity to the several large Jewish centers in and near New York. An earnest, able leader can be of inestimable value to the people in these centers.

II.

If it be true, as I have attempted to prove, that the Rabbi acting in his individual capacity can exercise a great influence upon the rich and poor, the employer and the employee to the end that a better industrial era be inaugurated, then it is indispensable that he be kept well informed of the situation. It is not enough that he know the leaders of the two classes, represented by capital and labor in his own city, he ought to know their aims and acts from a national and international point of view. His comprehension of the situation in the industrial world ought to be clear and extensive. Manifestly, it is impossible for any Rabbi to take sufficient time from his regular studies and duties to enable him to become familiar with the many phases of the labor problem, and to gather together from many sources and to study the statistics compiled by our various organizations. Such work can not properly be done by any one man. But a Standing Committee in Jewish statistics might be of great service to the Conference. Such a committee shall collect from every available source statistics of the Jewish people in all phases of industrialism as they affect the Synagogue. Monthly and quarterly bulletins might be issued to all members of the Conference. Thus the members would be kept in touch with matters of greatest concern to the welfare of our people.

III.

Inasmuch as our working people know so little of our aims and purposes, and have been led to believe through misrepresentation of our cause that liberal Judaism is disloyalty to and compromise with our faith, it would seem to be advisable from time to time to publish certain of our proceedings, lectures and tracts in the Yiddish language for distribution among them. A tract on Judaism and labor would seem to be most timely and appropriate. It should not be done with any secret desire to convert our truly orthodox brethren to the Reform Jewish party, but to give them information which will enable them to get at the truth of our movement.

It is not unlikely that the opinion often expressed will be verified in fact, that many thousands of our brethren who now so thoroughly misunderstand us, will recognize that they stand on precisely the same platform as we do in the earnest desire to retain all the fundamental principles and preserve as much of the formal side of Judaism as we have found after a reverent search reluctantly undertaken to be not absolutely incompatible with the highest and best in modern culture.

IV.

The Jewish press might be made a more potent influence in bringing together the wage earners and the employers. At present they are practically divided into the same classes that characterize the secular newspapers and periodicals of the country according as they are supported by the forces of labor or capital. If the main desideratum in the amelioration of present conditions is a full knowledge of the situation on the part of both parties, then it ought to be the duty of all Jewish newspapers and periodicals which record the affairs of the world to publish information about both. Let this Conference suggest to all Jewish papers the advisability of including in the items of interest about the capitalists the records of the struggles, achievements and purposes of the wage earners. It

would tend, perhaps, to amalgamate more closely the common interests of our people.

V.

The Board of Governors and the Faculty of the Hebrew Union College would not take amiss a suggestion to consider the advisability of arranging for a course of lectures to be given each year at the College, on the industrial conditions of our day. This will be an excellent way of introducing to the students a subject which they will be required to know as soon as they enter upon the work of the active ministry.

But over and above these issues of practical import, all engrossing and significant though they be, lies the sphere in which the Synagogue performs its indispensable function.

Let the Synagogue continue to stand without compromise for the totality of things. Let it resound with the insistence which has always characterized its teachings, the Unity of Mankind. Let it impart those principles which are not limited by time, place or circumstance, the prophetic ideals of justice, righteousness and kindness which, if understood, will enable men, at all times, in all places, and under all conditions, to improve their environment and amend their lives. The sanctuary in the wilderness never moved with any one of the tribes of Israel, nor was it ever the special protector of any class of workers. It went forward with all the people and it belonged to all the people. It was the medium through which peace was restored in the whole encampment whenever through rebellion or discord the people drifted from God or hated one another.

The question arises, to what extent can the Synagogue make concession to the spirit of the times? If it rigidly excludes consideration of problems that are of paramount issue in our day and rests satisfied by denouncing the sins of ancient Samaria and condemning the evildoers of ancient Jerusalem, then it is evident that it has no service worthy of the name to render its existence a blessing to mankind. If the Synagogue, on the contrary, be converted into a political platform on

which the latest utterance of some "boss-ridden" candidate shall be made the subject of serious discussion in the presence of men and women who hunger for the truths of religion; if the Synagogue be changed into a lecture forum from which learned disquisitions on every conceivable literary and scientific theory be delivered at the cost of the religious discourse, then the Synagogue becomes an unnecessary institution, a duplication of work which can be better and more effectively done under other auspices.

The Synagogue is here to do a work which no other institution is equipped to perform, the important work of keeping alive and intensifying the religious consciousness of Jews in accordance with the best traditions, laws and usages of Judaism. One aspect of this religious consciousness is the feeling that amid the changing scenes in the social, educational and industrial worlds, the old principles of perfect justice, righteousness and mercy are as unchangeable as God Himself. In one age men may tend their sheep; another generation may witness a change from shepherds to agriculturists; a later period may introduce the machine and transform the whole aspect of labor, but beneath all the changes are the same unalterable laws which men do well to remember. This is the work of the Synagogue to the Jewish people, to teach them that the God of Israel alone ruleth the world in majesty and that all workers are His children. It has wonderfully succeeded in the past, and if it remains true to its ideals there is no reason for supposing that it shall not succeed in the future.

Appendix A.

OCCUPATIONS.

"Unfortunately there is no census of occupations especially directed to the classification of the Jewish people of the East Side. But a study of the census of the occupations of the city at large, of the report of the Commission of Immigration, and of the labor movement on the East Side, probably throws

all the light on the subject that a general statement requires. . . . Nearly twenty percent of the Hebrew immigrants are tailors, nearly five percent merchants or clerks and almost one percent follow the professions. Of the remainder a very considerable proportion, though not a majority, are skilled workmen, such as bakers, tobacco workers, carpenters, painters, butchers, etc." (William E. Walling, in *University Studies*, July, 1905, p. 80.)

After an investigation of 225 families in a block of the lower East Side of New York, Dr. Bernheimer stated that "eighty-one or about one-third retained the same vocation as abroad. It is noteworthy that the largest proportion in any one occupation before coming here were tradesmen, viz., 66 out of 225 or about thirty percent." (*Jewish Immigrant as an Industrial Worker*, by Dr. Charles S. Bernheimer.)

In a study of 50 out of 225 families picked out at random, Dr. Bernheimer indicates the occupations in which Russian Jews are engaged. Peddlers, pressers and egg-candlers predominate. In the list it is shown that some of the workers who had been tradesmen were reduced to the rank of peddlers, laborers, pressers, painters, skirt operators, etc. A former shop foreman became a cloak presser; a real estate dealer was compelled to work as a salesman. And worst of all, a former teacher was forced to eke out a living as a peddler. These instances are typical of conditions prevailing on the East Side.

Speaking of the difficulties which confront the immigrant in selecting a trade in America, Dr. Blaustein says, "The immigrant is not accustomed to our industrial system. He can not understand our division of labor. He finds that between himself and his employer there is a wide gap. If he works in a factory he feels that he ceases to be an individual and becomes a hand, and that muscle rather than intellect will insure the permanency of his employment. In order to be his own master he prefers becoming a peddler, and in New York City a pushcart peddler, despite the long hours, the hardship and the uncertainty of the earnings." (*University Set-*

tlement Studies, David Blaustein, July, 1905.) The small capital required to purchase a stock, the independence of the peddler compared with other forms of labor, and the small expense to market his goods, are the reasons that incline the immigrant to embark upon a mercantile career in America as peddlers.

The majority of Jews in New York City are engaged in the needle industries. While the exact number can not be stated, it is probably true, as has been found in England, that no less than one-third of the total number of male Russians and Poles in England over ten years of age are employed in the tailoring trade. "It can not be said that the Jewish tailor has been convicted of any very pernicious influence upon the trade. He has introduced new methods and a new type of workmanship. . . . His work is confined to certain branches which he may be said to monopolize. . . . But this is perhaps an instance in which the process of the survival of the fittest is tolerably justified in its results." (Jew in London, pp. 66-69.)

"The sons do not follow in the footsteps of the fathers. They become clerks, salesmen and professional men. They add to the ranks of teachers, lawyers, physicians and dentists. They are becoming prosperous business men. . . . The immigrant girls enter the shops and factories; the girls born on American soil go into offices as clerks, bookkeepers and stenographers, or they enter stores as saleswomen, buyers and the like, or they become milliners and dressmakers.

"It is true that the Jewish immigrant does not become a street laborer, a railroad worker or a miner, as is the case with the Italian and Slav immigrant. But he does fill other economic wants. Some evidence of this is shown in the record of the Industrial Removal Office, whose business it is to place Jewish immigrants, particularly from New York City, in other sections of the country. . . . The Jews prefer those walks of life that are almost universally considered to be the higher walks. Many sentimental and well-meaning persons do not look at the matter in this way, but it is safe to say that ninety-

nine percent, when concerned with their own fate and that of other people close to them, prefer the commercial and professional pursuits." (Bernheimer.)

The prospects of the future are bright for the second generation, the children of the poor immigrant. Few are the families which have not been making great sacrifices for the education of their children. Young men who are not able to purchase more than the most ordinary clothing will tell you with pride that they are students at Columbia or the University of New York. Others who cherish ambition to enter the portals of some seat of learning can be seen any day rushing hurriedly through the streets importuning all they meet to purchase a paper. The sympathetic ear can detect in the appeal the determined note which means, "To enable me to go to school." How many realize that the poor suspender peddler, the toy vender, the pushcart man straighten their bent backs with justifiable pride when in the evening they read the reports of the high standing of their sons and daughters in the public schools, or learn of the honors won by them at the University.

"In some of the law schools, for instance, almost nine-tenths of the students are said to be Jews. In the College of the City of New York, which prepares for all sorts of professional studies, the proportion is not much less. . . . Even those who are not born in this country go to evening schools, and a great many pass this examination and enter into the professions and civil service." (Walling in *University Settlement Studies*, July, 1905, p. 85.)

Special mention must be made of the comparative absence of married Jewish women from all kinds of occupations. It is comparatively rare that the woman is impelled by necessity to go to the factory to work. Some male member of the family will manage somehow to protect the woman from the hardship of modern industrial life, and free her for the duties of the home. (*Jewish Chronicle*, July 31, 1908.)

Appendix B.

TRADE UNIONISM.

"The first attempts at organization among Jewish workmen antedate the main influx of Jewish immigration into England and America. The first union of Jewish tailors in New York was organized in 1877. It had an ephemeral existence. When in the eighties, Jews began to arrive in large numbers, the need of organizations was soon realized. Several unions came into existence, and strikes were declared, which met with varying degrees of success." (Jew. Ency., vol. xii, p. 217.)

Prof. I. A. Hourwich then describes the varying fortunes of the Cloak-Makers' Union until it was broken up. "With the restoration of business prosperity in 1897 it was revived, and has since had a continuous existence, its paying membership reaching at one time 15000; but at other times its membership has sunk very close to the zero point.

"The history of other Jewish unions is similar to that of the Cloak-Makers' Union, which under normal conditions has the largest membership. The weakness of all Jewish Unions in the tailoring trades is the fluctuating character of their membership." Prof. John R. Commons, in his report on Immigration and its Economic Effects, prepared for the Industrial Commission, speaks as follows regarding the character of Jewish trade unions in the United States:

"The Jew's conception of a labor organization is that of a tradesman rather than that of a workman. In the clothing manufacture they all come together and form a giant union and at once engage in a strike. They bring in ninety-five percent of the trade. They are energetic and determined. They demand the entire and complete elimination of the abuse. The demand is almost always unanimous, and is made with enthusiasm and bitterness. . . . During a strike large numbers of them are to be found with almost nothing to live upon and their families suffering, still insisting, on the streets and in their halls, that their great cause must be won. But when

once the strike is settled, either in favor of or against the cause, they are contented, and that usually ends the union, since they do not see any practical use for a union when there is no cause to fight for. Consequently, the membership of a Jewish Union is wholly uncertain. The Secretary's books will show 60,000 members in one month and not 5,000 within three months later."

There are various causes which, in a general way, make the Jew less distinguished as a labor union man than his Christian fellow-worker; to a certain extent, they are to be mentioned as an honor to the Jew.

First, there is the "character of the Jew, who has an inborn desire to be 'his own boss'; the ambition of the Jewish worker is to rise above the working class, rather than to improve his own condition simultaneously with that of his class." The tendency of the trades union to lower the standard of the really efficient worker has estranged the Jew. "The Jewish unions of New York are combined in a central body, known as the United Hebrew Trades. This federation comprises the unions of those working in the clothing trades, of compositors, of employees of the Jewish theatres, and a few minor unions. Some of these unions are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor." (Prof. Hourwich, *Jew. Ency.* xii, p. 217.)

It must be noted that many thousands of Jewish workmen are affiliated with the general labor unions, the membership of which is largely Christian. Mr. Alexander H. Kaminsky states that "the Jewish workmen in America have given to organized labor no ground of complaint in the past. They have stood by their fellow-workers of other nationalities in their efforts to better the condition of labor." (*Federation Review*, June, 1908.)

Appendix C.

DISEASE.

Frequent reference is made to the prevalence of disease among Jewish workingmen by irresponsible, though prominent, investigators. The figures cited below will tend to disprove the allegations.

1. Tuberculosis.

"The social environment of the bulk of the Jews in Europe and America is favorable for the development and spread of tuberculosis. As is well known, town dwellers are more liable to this disease than inhabitants of the country. Hardly one-sixth of the Jews in the world live in the country, while from one-half to three-fourths of the non-Jewish population of Europe and America are country dwellers. This alone would lead us to expect that the tuberculosis morbidity and mortality should be higher among Jews than among Christians. If to this be added the social factors which are inimical to the health and well-being of town dwellers, such as indoor occupations, we should not be surprised if we found that they are more often affected by this disease than are people of other faiths who mostly work outdoors. They often work in sweat-shops, and usually live in old and unsanitary parts of cities.

"But in spite of all these unfavorable conditions, statistics, wherever available, show conclusively that the mortality from tuberculosis is about one-half to one-third that are observed among the non-Jewish population around them. The rates per 10,000 population were in Berlin, 9.81 among Jews and 21.66 among Christians; in Vienna, Jews 17.9, Protestants 32.8 and Catholics 49.6; in Lemberg, Jews 30.64 and Christians 63.51; in Roumania, Jews 25.6 and Christians 38.7; in London, Jews 13.3, general population 17.9; in New York City, Russian Jews 17.24, general population 23.94. In fact, the Jewish inhabitants of the lower East Side of New York City have a lower mortality rate from tuberculosis than the rich and prosperous who live in the upper west side of the city.

This in spite of the exceptional congestion of population, unsanitary surroundings, dangerous trades in sweat-shops, malnutrition, anemia, poverty, etc., which are rampant in the lower East Side. . . .

Dr. Fishberg then declares that "The main cause of the lower tuberculosis mortality of the Jews is the fact that for two thousand years they have been city dwellers. They have thus been thoroughly urbanized, and adapted their organism to city and indoor life. Most of the terrors of urban congestion, indoor occupations and unsanitary surroundings which breed tuberculosis among people who are not adapted to such a milieu have lost their significance to them." (Tuberculosis among Jews, by Dr. Maurice Fishberg, in *American Israelite*, October 15, 1908.)

2. Alcoholism.

"The part which a temperate habit of life has played in the victorious progress of the Jewish workman can hardly be overestimated. Of all the circumstances which tell in his favor, the fact that he does not get drunk is one of the foremost. And although this superiority to alcohol is doubtless in part a matter of physical constitution, it must also be regarded as partly the outcome of a disciplined and usually tenacious character. The poor Jew is not easily demoralized, and can spend his life without respect to circumstances in the unflagging pursuit of an end." (Jew in London, by Russell and Lewis, p. 64.)

Dr. Hall, of Leeds, in investigating 2,700 children, instituted a comparison between Jewish and Gentile children in the poorer schools of Leeds. He states that "at eight years old the poor Jewish child was on the average three pounds heavier and two inches taller than his Gentile comrade. At ten years of age the Jew has the advantage of six and one-fourth pounds in weight and two and one-half inches in height. Fifty percent of the Gentile children had rickets, and only seven percent of the Jews." He attributes this to the better feeding of the children of Jewish parents, and he proved his point by feeding

a certain number of children regularly from one of the poorest schools and showed that they increased both in weight and height more rapidly than those who were left to the tender mercies of their parents." (English Child Life, by Percy Alden, M. P., in Outlook, August 1, 1908, p. 761.)

Appendix D.

CRIMINALITY.

It is undoubtedly true that the industrial evils, such as inadequate wage and lack of leisure and unsanitary workshops, causing congestion in the home and under-feeding, have been conducive to the spread of criminality among Jewish working people and indirectly among their sons and daughters, but the subjoined statistics utterly refute the sweeping charges so frequently made.

"The total number of indictments of Jewish persons in New York County during the year 1907 was 666. Compared with the Jewish population of New York County, estimated by the American Jewish Committee at 750,000, as of December 31, 1907, the total number of indicted persons was less than one in every thousand Jewish inhabitants (0.0888%).

"The total number of Gentiles indicted in the same county during the same period was 3,907. The total population of New York City on December 31, 1907, was estimated by the Board of Health at 2,687,800 persons; this leaves for the Gentile population 1,937,800. The number of indicted Gentiles was accordingly more than two in every thousand Gentile inhabitants. These figures show that criminality among the Jews of New York was not one-half as high as among the Gentiles."

"It must be borne in mind, however, that an indicted person is not necessarily a criminal. Of the 666 indicted Jews, 86 were acquitted and 460 were convicted, while 120 were disposed of in other ways. The following table contains comparative statistics of Jews and Gentiles convicted of crime:

"Jews with population of 750,000 showed .0613% of criminals, or 450.

"Gentiles with population of 1,937,800 showed .1233% of criminals, or 2,388.

"This table conclusively disproves the sensational clamor about alarming Jewish criminality. The majority of convicted Jewish criminals are not of the violent type.

"The same tendency is likewise reflected in the penalties to which the Jews were sentenced, as compared with Gentiles.

"A fact of great significance is brought to light by the age statistics of convicted criminals: The highest criminality among the Jews, as compared with Gentiles, is found between the ages of 15 and 20, more than one-half of the convicted Jewish criminals were minors.

"It is a fact familiar to everybody from personal observation and borne out by statistics of immigration and population, that among the Jews above the age of 21 the foreign-born vastly predominate—whereas among the minors a large percentage are Americans. The inference is that the percentage of criminals among the Jewish immigrants is lower than among Jewish children who have grown up on the streets of New York.

"While the ratio of criminality among adult Jews is less than one-third of the ratio among adult Gentiles, Jewish children hardly differ in this respect from Gentile children. Apparently, the moral influences which kept the Jew away from the criminal path in his old home are lacking in the bringing up of the youth in New York." (Statement of Prof. Isaac A. Hourwich on Jewish Criminality in New York in 1907, a review of the statistics compiled by Mr. Mark J. Katz, in *Federation Review*, June, 1908.)

3. White Slave Traffic.

Reference must be made to the most despicable of all crimes from which our people are unfortunately not free. The situation has been well presented in an editorial in the *London Jewish Chronicle* (October 30, 1908). "We have been brought to the conclusion that it is our duty to speak out and to throw

the light of day upon an infamy which is growing apace in our community which, day by day, is bringing deep shame upon it, and to which, at all hazards and at all costs, the community must seek to put an end. Of these offenses our people are by no means free. It is idle to deny it; it is only making matters worse to ignore it; it is cowardly not to face it. Too long have we hidden almost from ourselves in very shame the whole nauseous and nauseating question."

While it is our duty to face the situation bravely and in no uncertain terms to denounce the evildoers and speedily to bring them to justice, we must be on the alert to answer the sweeping charges which are made against our people as being chief offenders against virtue and morality in this nefarious traffic. The words of Mr. William Alexander Coote (Secretary of the National Vigilance Committee of England), an international authority on the evils of the White Slave Traffic, are illuminating on the subject. After studying the conditions in Europe, America and other parts of the world, Mr. Coote has expressed strong condemnation of the sweeping charges against the Jews' participation in the White Slave Traffic, as follows:

"I do not, however, endorse all that you say. For instance, you imply that the traffic in women is almost wholly confined to a section of the Jewish people. I have been through Europe, America and other parts of the world and my experience does not coincide with your conclusion. I quite agree with you that far too many of the Jewish race are engaged in this infamous traffic, and that in England, especially, it is a growing evil. . . . In the East End the Jew engaged in this traffic is very poor, and not by any means so clever at it as the Germans or the Frenchman, consequently he is more frequently caught and prosecuted. Jews thus figure predominately in the police reports, and hence, I think, the mistaken notion that the Jews are almost entirely responsible . . . there are other quarters of London worse, in my opinion, so far as this traffic is concerned. In these quarters this crime is reduced to a science, and the dealers are able to defy the authorities because they know how to

evade the existing laws. There are many parts of London where this traffic is carried on by wealth which has been obtained by means of this traffic, and whose cunning and resourcefulness are almost omnipotent. These men rarely blunder and are rarely caught. We know some of them, and they are as interested in our doings as we are in theirs, as I say they have reduced this business to a science, and the methods they adopt leave very little risk of discovery." (Jewish Chronicle, Nov. 6, 1908.) It is equally true of New York City and other large cities in America, if the words of careful observers are to be trusted.

Many have said that the White Slave Traffic among the Jews is not to be compared with that of the other peoples. It is most often "dumped," so to speak, upon the poor, from the wealthier sections of the city, and the poor groaning under intolerable economic burdens have not left the strength and will to cut it root and branch from their lives.

But this is no consolation to us, that so dreadful a social crime is to be found among non-Jews to as great, if not greater, extent than among Jews; it should be our own immediate, consecrated task, in the name of Heaven, to burn the evil from the midst of our people and to aid in every way the efforts of the State and city as well as private organization to blot out this crime against society.

Appendix E.

STANDARD OF LIVING.

A very exhaustive investigation was made during the past year of the standards of living among 391 poor families in New York City by the Russell Sage Foundation. Of the 391 families closely observed, 78 were Russian. While the number is not sufficiently large to afford a basis for accurate conclusions, yet they are sufficient to indicate the general conditions.

On the question of overcrowding, the Russians are recorded as having sixty percent of the families living 1.5 persons per

room. This compares with other nationalities as follows ("Standards of Living," by Dr. R. C. Chapin, p. 105):

Native American.....	30%
Teutonic	21%
Irish	50%
Colored	57%
Italian	65%
Austrian	66%
Bohemian	79%

(Dr. Laidlaw reports that in 1901-1902, in the 22d Assembly District, nine percent of the Jewish families (865) were crowded over two persons to the room, even including the kitchen. Eighty percent of the families were without bath. This compares with ninety percent of the people at large, without bath.

If the whole municipal area (209,218 acres) of Greater New York were peopled as densely as the lower East Side, or 383 to the acre, we could put within the limits of the city every man, woman and child in the United States and half the Filipinos. The 8th Assembly District has even a denser population, namely, 735 to the acre throughout its 98 acres. If New York in its whole area were peopled as densely as this section, it would have over 150,000,000 persons. (Am. Heb., May 19, 1905.) The lower East Side contains about 1/150 of the whole municipal area of Greater New York, but at the same time holds 1-7 of the city's whole population.

On the matter of underfeeding, the largest number is reported of the Russians, 26 families, or 45.5%, comparing with others as follows:

Italian	5.3%
Irish	8.3%
Native Americans.....	14.9%
Teutonic	20.5%
Colored	28.6%
Bohemian	28.6%
Austrian	34.5%
Russian	45.5% (ibid., p. 128).

Of the families investigated only five percent of the Russians reported receiving gifts or assistance from societies, comparing with others as follows:

Italian	9%
Austrian	16%
Bohemian	21%
Teutonic	33%
Irish	46%
Native American.....	48%
Colored	54% (ibid., p. 189).

The largest number of families having membership in Benefit Societies was found among the Russians, being 26, comparing with others:

Irish	1
Colored	3
Italian	3
Native American.....	7
Teutonic	8
Bohemian	8
Austrian	13
Russian	26 (ibid., p. 193).

Interesting is the following itemized account of expenditures for food in a Jewish family per week. The family consists of father, mother, four boys, aged six, four, two years, and six months respectively:

Meats and Fish.

	Weekly Expenditure
7 lbs. beef.....	\$0.84
1 lb. mutton.....	.16
2 lbs. fish.....	.20
2 cans salmon.....	.28
	<hr/> \$1.48

Eggs, Dairy Products, Etc.

2 lbs. butter.....	\$0.64	
2 pkgs. cheese.....	.08	
1 doz. eggs.....	.24	
6 qts. milk (at Straus depot).....	.20	
3 cans condensed milk.....	.30	\$1.46

Cereals.

7 loaves of bread.....	\$0.56	
24 rolls20	
3½ lbs. flour.....	.10	
¼ lb. cereal.....	.02	\$0.88

Vegetables and Fruits.

6 lbs. potatoes.....	\$0.09	
2 lbs. onions.....	.06	
Fresh vegetables.....	.10	
1 lb. dried beans.....	.08	
1 lb. dried peas.....	.04	
Fresh fruit.....	.15	
½ lb. dried prunes.....	.06	\$0.58

Sugar, Tea, Etc.

⅛ lb. tea	\$0.05	
¼ lb. coffee05	
3½ lbs. sugar.....	.20	
¼ lb. spice.....	.02	\$0.32

Alcoholic Drinks.

Wine on holidays, \$1.50 per year.....	\$0.03	
----------------------------------------	--------	--

\$4.75

"The father is a carpenter (non-union) with wages of \$15.00 a week, but, on account of unemployment, earning only \$600 a year, which is the entire income of the family." (Standards of Living," p. 156f.)

Dr. Lee K. Frankel has written a description of the average home of the workman making \$600 per year, recognized as a minimum wage upon which to support a family just beyond the border of abject poverty: "The furniture equipment of such a family is in most instances meagre. If there are three rooms, the so-called parlor is a combined parlor, sittingroom and bedroom. As a rule, it contains a bed and a few chairs. Occasionally a rocking chair or a sofa is found. In the corner there is a sewing machine; on the walls a few cheap pictures, family portraits and the like. Cheap ornaments are found here and there. In some instances the floor is covered with a cheap carpet. The second room, which is a combination diningroom and kitchen, has a table covered with oilcloth, a few chairs, a stove, and kitchen utensils which hang on the walls, owing to the lack of a cupboard. Frequently an icebox is found. The third room, which is a bedroom, contains an iron foldingbed, chair and trunk. Clothes hang on the wall; seldom is there a bureau. The washing of the family is done at the sink in the kitchen, there being no washstands or washbowls in the bedroom. . . . The disbursements per annum for furniture average \$6.00, for which the housewife declares she can purchase only the necessary things. These include dishes, table linens, beds, chairs, kitchen utensils and supplies for cleaning. If more than this is required, for example, mirrors, sewing machines, etc., resort must be made to instalment purchases. . . . Most of the disbursements for insurance, which averages \$13 per annum, are for so-called life and burial insurance. The food disbursement for such a family approximates \$270 per annum, for five individuals, or 3.3 units. . . . Russia and Austrian Jewish families have special dinners on Friday evenings or on Saturday, using fish or fowl. . . . The family clothes itself at a cost of \$84 per annum. . . . The budget permits

a disbursement of \$14 for the preservation of the health of the family—or rather sickness requires this disbursement. . . . Eight dollars is spent annually by this family for taxes and contributions. . . . Depending upon the location in which the family lives the amount spent for carfare varies. The \$3 that the family may spend for recreation permits of almost no diversion. . . . For educational purposes the family spends \$5 per annum, most of which is used for the daily newspaper. . . . This leaves a total of \$25 per annum for miscellaneous expenditures, including moving, payment of debts," etc. ("Report of Special Committee on Standard of Living.")

Appendix F.

AMUSEMENTS.

The need of recreation and diversion among the working people is heightened by the strain and fatigue of the workday. But unhappily, in proportion to their need are the opportunities for wholesome recreation so essential to the social and physical equilibrium of the individual, denied them. The homes of the people are too small to permit with any decency the reception of their friends for sweet converse. For diversion, the people are practically driven from their homes. In summer they flock into the streets wandering aimlessly to and fro, or visit the crowded recreation piers, or if they can manage to scrape together enough from their earnings to warrant it, take a trip to one of the many pleasure resorts in the vicinity of New York. Many congregate in the thousand and one coffeehouses in the East Side, where the demand for social expression is granted to many a weary toiler. The coffeehouse to the Jew is what the saloon is to many Christians. In the reeking coffeehouses of New York many a student to fame unknown stimulates his eager listeners with reports of the great world of science and art, and debates ensue which arouse the latent powers of thought and expression of the denizens of the

Ghetto. While gambling is resorted to in many of the coffee-houses, there prevails in most of them a spirit of sociability and scientific inquiry. The habitues are made to feel at home; no time limit is placed upon them; some stimulus to self-expression granted and the society of one's fellows without reserve is thoroughly enjoyed, so that the coffeehouses in New York are potent factors in the social life of the Jews.

The theaters, especially during the fall and winter, mostly every night in the week, attract large crowds of people who are swayed now to a high pitch of joyous emotion and then cast into the lowest depths of grief and pain, as they view scenes depicting the life of their native Russian villages and hear in the Yiddish a description of the dangers of the new home. They are visibly affected as they recall by the suggestion of the drama their own experiences as they started for the new world with fear and trembling lest the reports be true that in the new home they would be forced to forget their Judaism. The Yiddish theaters in New York have been great educational influences upon the Jewish poor, but there are now some fears expressed that in their commercialization less regard will be paid to the appeal and need of the people than to the convenience and greed of the managers.

Among the young people in summer and winter the dance halls, numbering many hundreds, supply the medium of social expression. They are fraught with the gravest dangers to the morals of the men and women who frequent them. Miss Julia Schonfeld has performed a real service in the cause of morality in making for the Committee on Amusements a thorough investigation into the evils of the dance halls, pointing out how young girls through drink, so easily procurable in the halls, and through flattery and solicitation of men, are led to their ruin.

POLITICS.

In politics the Jewish poor in New York City have given evidence of an independence and deliberation which are the

virtues most applauded and most frequently offended by the citizens of our Republic. Staid politicians confess that the East Side is an unknown quantity in city, State and National elections. The voters exercise a judgment in the choice of their candidates which argues most strongly for their true appreciation of the honor and obligation of citizenship in a democratic government.

For a time the immigrant is perplexed in his estimation of the vaunted American liberty and enlightenment. But soon his Jewish independence and love of truth assert themselves and he becomes an independent in politics. There are leaders, however, who claim that the independence of the Jewish vote is exaggerated. It is undoubtedly true that the tendency of some of our people to organize themselves as Jewish political clubs in order to command political patronage is both against the principles of the American government and according to our best thinkers antagonistic to the spirit of Judaism. It is interesting to observe that Hillquit, a leader of the Socialist party, to which it is claimed so many Jewish voters are pledged, received only some 2483 votes on the whole East Side in the last congressional election (1908).

Appendix G.

RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS.

Dr. Blaustein stated as his belief that out of the estimated 200,000 Jewish workmen in New York City, about twenty-five percent keep the Sabbath. Sixty percent of this number work in shops of contractors, while the remaining forty percent work in factories where the Sabbath is observed.

Congestion is indirectly a religious problem because many a Jew, purely because of his love of Judaism, "is not willing to leave the large city and settle in a smaller place 'in the country,' as he calls it, for there he fears there are not a sufficient number of Jews to form a Jewish community; he will be de-

prived of religious service; he will be obliged to break his Sabbath, violate the dietary laws, and above all, his child will grow up without a religious and Hebrew education." (David Blaustein, in "University Settlement Studies," p. 77f, July, 1905.)

On the high holy days, the vast majority of Jews are very careful to visit the many temporary Synagogues which spring up over night. Hundreds of dance halls, theaters, saloons and dwellings are converted into Synagogues, which are thronged with worshippers. The exact number of these temporary sanctuaries is not known. Many of the projectors advertise extensively to attract the people by offering as a special attraction some celebrated singer or cantor. It most frequently happens that the only qualification which the advertised celebrity possesses is the ability to sing the old melodies. As to moral and intellectual fitness no questions are asked. In many of the dance halls on the East Side can be seen at any time the "Aron Hakodesh" pushed into a corner, awaiting the return of the holy days to be pressed at a moment's notice into service.

Many of the responsible leaders of New York Jewry have raised their voices in protest against this evil that shames us on the approach of our festivals. The New York community has made an earnest attempt to control the situation. During the last summer arrangements were made with a number of large halls, and notably with the Educational Alliance, to hold services on the holy days under more esthetic auspices. While some reforms were gained, the problem is just touched, and a great deal of work is before the community before it will be free from the scandal of the temporary Synagogues.

Some Jewish employers permit their Jewish employees to absent themselves from business on the holy days. Others prohibit it on the penalty of immediate dismissal. Some workmen are not interested in the matter at all, while many sincerely regret the economic necessity which compels them to labor on the holy days.

In September, 1907, a letter was sent from the office of the

Adjutant General of the War Department of the United States at the instance of the Union of Orthodox Congregations of America, authorizing department commanders in the United States "to grant the privilege to soldiers of the Jewish faith to be absent from their duties for such length of time as may be necessary to enable them to attend to divine services" (New Year and Atonement Days).

The same privilege was secured for the employees of the Post-Office Department of New York City. On the first day of New Year, out of 1000 Jewish employes, 750 took advantage of the privilege; on the second day, 440; on Yom Kippur, 900 availed themselves of the opportunity of rest. (Am. Heb., November 15, 1907.)

We must remember that the difficulties in the path of loyalty are tremendously heightened in a land which makes no pretense at identifying religion with the affairs of State, so that each individual is left free to affiliate with a Synagogue or to separate himself from it. For this reason Russian Jews in America, who are religious, are more to be honored for their loyalty to Judaism than in Russia, where the small communities organized under a sort of ecclesiastical authority exacted of them a complete adherence to all the laws whether they were the essential or the unessential ordinances of our faith. But here in America by their deliberate choice in a free environment, our people indicate their loyalty to our faith, not in strict conformity to all the minute regulations of the law framed in part, for a particular time, or for a particular environment, but with a deep love for the essential laws, and in a true appreciation of its best poetry and symbolism. As a result, we may expect to find here a more intelligent and devoted people than in any other land.

In addition to the worship held in the various Synagogues of the city, the free religious services regularly conducted in the Educational Alliance, the Emanuel Brotherhood and the Young Men's Hebrew Association and other associations deserve special recognition as potent influences in the deepening of

their love for Judaism among the working people. These same and other institutions have been doing excellent work in the religious instruction of the children of the working people. At the same time it must not be forgotten that in all the Synagogues up to the limit of their capacity, all who seek entrance, whether working people or not, are made welcome. This is not the opinion prevailing among many people, but it is based upon ignorance and misrepresentation. Let anyone to convince himself visit any of the Synagogues, and he will not be turned away. And for the privilege he will not be asked to pay.

Rabbi Harris—Our first question must be, Does the Synagogue consider the workingman? It does. The Torah in its earliest code book makes laws for his protection: First, that the bondman must be free in the seventh year and his wants supplied liberally from flock, threshing floor and wine press. The honor of the bondwoman must be thoroughly safeguarded. If espoused, her food, raiment and duty of marriage must not be diminished. If the master slay any of his slaves he must be punished. If he injure them they must go free. They are further commended to his compassion and regard.

The free servant is known in Scripture as the "hired man." In addition to a general warning against oppressing him, there is a strict command with regard to him. His wages must not be delayed even over night. Each age grapples with its own particular problems. Evidently that was the workingman's grievance in that day when factories were not and sweat-shops had yet to come.

Even the Hebraic poor laws had the workingman always in view. For then, as now, when speaking of the workingman's problem, it is always the *poor* workingman. Deuteronomy xxiv, 14, connects them—"the hired servant that is poor." All did manual labor in the days when even King Saul followed the plow. And all work in this age of industrialism, when leisure is no longer the hallmark of the gentleman. So only the workingman below a certain standard of living enters into our sociological consideration today. The Mosaic laws touching

the remission of debts in the seventh year and the restoration of family estates in the fiftieth year all have in mind the humble workingman. The theory that the land is God's not man's, forms the basis of Henry George's Single Tax law, whereby he hoped to solve the difficulties of the laboring classes.

Why then this question presented for our consideration? For behind it is the recognition that an estrangement has occurred between the Synagogue and the workingman—or at least one group of the laboring classes. Is it because the Synagogue is too aristocratic? No. The aristocratic priestly Sadducee class disappeared early in post-exilic Judea, replaced by the misrepresented Pharisees. That misunderstood class formed the democracy of Israel. Certainly after the Temple fell and the "Synagogue" as such was launched, it was launched on democratic lines. If there was any aristocracy, it was that of learning only. The Rabbis not only taught the dignity of labor, they lived it and were its own best exemplars. They were fond of quadrilaterals; we may recall that famous one—"Study, Charity, Piety, Work."

But some say today that the cost of congregational membership is too high. They speak of the "offerings" (*schnoder*) and the costly privileges, sale of *mitzvoth* of the Orthodox Synagogue on the one hand, and the pew rentals of the Reform Synagogue on the other, as discouraging the working classes.

Gentlemen, the annual theatre outlay of the workingman would pay his membership in the most fashionable Synagogue in the land five times over. Nay, the sum total of the tips that a young man disburses or the outlays of a young woman at the soda-water fountain during a year would more than pay the congregational membership. Further, the weekly payment of the Catholic servant in the kitchen to her church often outweighs the congregational expenditure to the Synagogue of the Jewish family that employs her. It seems much only when made at one payment.

Moreover, the informality of the Synagogue enables the workingman actually to improvise a divine service right behind

his shop. This he often does. Furthermore, the Synagogue is doing much to meet the workingman more than half way in these days in opening free synagogues, in establishing extension services in its sisterhoods, settlements and social institutes. Again, in order that the workingman who must always be a workingman, even on the Sabbath, should not be denied the spiritual opportunity of divine service, it has, in this land at least, instituted late Friday night services and Sunday services. Nevertheless there is this estrangement. Let us look deeper still.

The Synagogue service and ceremonial do not appeal to the workingman. This particularly applies to the workingman who a little earlier had been an American boy of foreign parentage. The Synagogue ritual and its language are to him obscure. The religious rites practiced in the home convey no meaning and an unfortunate makeshift manner of observance leaves a bad impression. The religiousness behind the traditional rite, doubtless latent in the parental heart, is not manifest to him. He saw only a meaningless formula. And this came to be in his superficial mind religion's definition, while much that he was told of the beliefs of his ancestry of creation and of miracle did not tally with many of the scientific data presented in his American public school.

The Synagogue must meet this class by simplifying and clarifying the ritual of Judaism, and so modifying its ceremonial that it will appeal to the emotion of today. Furthermore, it must be absolutely sincere in the statement of what it believes and in the acknowledgment of what it does not believe, both in doctrine and in observance. The word "tradition" must not be a convenient cloak for outworn rites or exploded theories. If Judaism is to make a real appeal to the workingman—aye, unto any man—there must be no dishonest reservations.

But there is yet a further group among the working classes who will not enter the Synagogue, not because they are repelled by its quaint or obscure customs, but because it questions the fundamentals of religion itself. Many of our workingmen are

socialists. There is nothing in socialism as such that is opposed to the belief in a divine Providence. None the less for reasons that can not be discussed here, socialism usually involves not only a condemnatory attitude toward society as at present organized, but also against religion. To his mind they are supposed to hang together. For those who support the established order of things usually support the established religions. The socialistic workingman in whose hands dangerous literature is placed often brutally denies the fundamentals of faith. We must not be discouraged at this agnostic attitude of many of the working classes. A little education has robbed them of their faith; a little more education will restore it to them again. Let us go on patiently searching for the truth, teaching the truth as we believe it, and sincerity, persistence and patience will ultimately tell.

For there is yet another reason why the workingman, whatever his belief, feels hostile to the Church and the Synagogue and comes to mistrust the religions behind them. He considers that the established religions are on the side of the capitalist, and the capitalist is his natural foe. Is this true? Not entirely. The clergy may sometimes be apologetic in the presence of the wealthy, and, conservative by temperament and calling, may preach contentment and appeal for the maintenance of the status quo, which involves that vast gulf between the millionaire and the pauper. So while this charge of the workingman is not entirely true of any of the clergy and altogether false of some of the clergy, yet, on the whole, there is just enough truth in it to make it sting.

Yet in the constant conflicts that arise between capital and labor, is it the duty of the clergy always to side with the working class? Does he not tyrannize just as soon as he gets the whip hand? Certainly we of the Synagogue have never believed that it is impossible for the rich man to enter heaven. It can not be candidly said that the workingman is one whit less selfish than the man of wealth. He is only less successful. The workingman is trying to attain the rich man's place just

as quickly as he can, and among some of our people the change is actually going on before our very eyes. Why, then, other things being equal, should the ministers rather take the side of the workingman? Because he is the under dog. Because he is the weaker, strong only in the combination of his units, whose lot is less happy and who is more completely at the mercy of cruel circumstances. We should stand on the side of the workingman then, because he is often the submerged class, and our place is by the side of the submerged class. That is our metier, our motif. And the great Prophets, always the ideals for our profession, stand as exemplars. Not till the workingman realizes that our sympathies are with him can we ever hope to reach him.

Some will tell us that we should not meddle with labor questions, that that is not part of our duty. They say further that we really know nothing about the economic, technical and sociological issues involved. If we do not know these issues intimately, then it is time we did. More important is it that we should study the problems of the workingman around us than the literature in obscure tongues and in musty tomes of a thousand years ago. Not that I would be Philistine enough to deprecate that work of the ministry either. But the ministry must be sufficiently comprehensive to include within its domain both the special scholar and the social worker.

A Gentile Head Worker of a downtown settlement complained to me that when the Jewish boys of the neighborhood drifted into evil courses she could not appeal to the local Rabbis. She found them foreigners, ignorant of the life around them, whose sole duty was the decision of cases of ritual law. She did not say *poskin shaaloth*, yet she gauged the situation.

As to the protest that this is not within the sphere of our duties, let it be remembered that there is a religious side to all the issues of life and it is distinctly the function of religion to disclose the religious side. Indeed, making clear the ethical principle involved in a labor dispute should be just the contribution needed to decide it and just the contribution that

the religionist can best bring. We must make it convincing that no problem is really solved unless it is solved rightly. Let the opportunist temporize for a victory for the moment to quiet down the strife between labor and capital, so that it may subside for a while. It is the function of the religionist in all the questions of life to look to the future, to work for the future and to be satisfied with no solution of any difficulty unless it is the solution for tomorrow as well as today.

If then the ministry proves its sympathy with the working classes, yet at the same time plants its foot firmly on the rock of moral principle, then it will not only bring the Synagogue to the workingman, it will also bring the workingman to the Synagogue.

Rabbi Cohen—I will detain you but a moment. I have listened with great satisfaction to the paper of Brother Foster—in fact, I have read the paper. It squares largely with what I think myself of the relationship of the synagogue and the workman. I have in Galveston a congregation largely composed of workingmen. Our docks are full of them. They carry their burdens and unload their trucks, and on Friday night they come to my synagogue, and when there is no work on the docks on Saturday they come to my synagogue. The work done in the synagogue in Galveston with the workingmen has been largely personal. I have gone down in the slums where they work, and have asked them these questions, the statistics of which Rabbi Foster has so largely gathered, and I have been put in a position to minister to their spiritual needs and ever see that our synagogue in Galveston is one with them. There is no antagonism with them. We do not know any rich and we do not know any poor. We are working for one end, and they have the utmost confidence in us, and, what is more, we have it in them. And while it is impossible for this state of affairs to obtain in large cities, the recommendation of Rabbi Foster stands good; there should be a certain center wherein the claims of the Synagogue can be made manifest to the workingman, and you will find that he will heartily respond.

Isaac Mayer Wise

Founder of

Central Conference of American Rabbis

President 1889-1900

PRESIDENTS.

ISAAC M. WISE	1889-1900
JOSEPH SILVERMAN	1900-1903
JOSEPH KRAUSKOFF	1903-1905
JOSEPH STOLZ	1905-1907
DAVID PHILIPSON	1907-1909
MAX HELLER	1909

DECEASED MEMBERS.

SAMUEL ADLER, New York	1891
LIEBMAN ADLER, Chicago	1892
M. SOLOMON, Appleton, Wis.	1892
HEINRICH ZIBNDORF, Cincinnati ..	1893
HERMAN BIRKENTHAL, Hamilton, Ont.	1893
HENRY M. BIEN, Vicksburg, Miss.	1895
LEON STRAUSS, Belleville, Ill.	1895
AARON WISE, New York	1896
ISRAEL JOSEPH, Montgomery, Ala.	1897
DAVID FEUERLICHT, Owensboro, Ky.	1897
IGNATZ GROSSMANN, Chicago	1897
ISAAC M. WISE, Cincinnati	1900
I. STEMPEL, Yonkers, N. Y.	1900
ABRAHAM LAZARUS, Houston, Tex.	1900
OSCAR J. COHEN, Mobile, Ala.	1901
AARON LOEWENHEIM, Chicago	1901
ADOLPH MOSES, Louisville	1902
BENJAMIN SZOLD, Baltimore	1902
MOSES MIELZINER, Cincinnati	1903
GUSTAVE GOTTHEIL, New York	1903
E. K. FISCHER, Chattanooga	1903
LIPPMAN MAYER, Pittsburg	1904
AARON NORDEN, Chicago	1905
H. J. M. CHUMACEIRO, Curacao, Dutch West Indies	1905
ISAAC SCHWAB, St. Joseph, Mo.	1907
RAPHAEL BENJAMIN, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1907
EMANUEL L. HESS, St. Paul, Minn.	1907

JUDAH WECHSLER, Indianapolis, Ind.	1907
ALOIS KAISER, Baltimore, Md.	1908
BERNHARD FELSENTHAL, Chicago, Ill.	1908
JACOB VOORSANGER, San Francisco, Cal.	1908
SOLOMON SONNENSCHIN, St. Louis, Mo.	1908
ADOLPH M. RADIN, New York City.....	1909
JOSEPH HERZ, Columbus, Miss.	1909
L. WEISS, Bradford, Pa.	1909
SIGMUND MANNHEIMER, Cincinnati.....	1909
BENJAMIN A. BONNHEIM, Cincinnati	1909

MEMBERS OF THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN
RABBIS.

HONORARY MEMBER.

WINTNER, LEOPOLD, Ph. D. Rabbi emeritus, Temple Beth Elohim, Brooklyn;
401 W. 117th St., New York City.

ACTIVE MEMBERS.

- Aaron, Israel, B. A., D. D., Rabbi, Temple Beth Zion, 748 Auburn Ave.,
Buffalo, N. Y.
- Abelson, Alter, Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El, Benton Hotel, Helena, Mont.
- Alexander, David, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Shomer Emoonim, 229 Win-
throp St., Toledo, O.
- Anspacher, Abraham S., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Chesed, Scrant-
on, Pa.
- Barnstein, Henry, Ph. D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 702 Gray Ave.,
Houston, Tex.
- Bauer, Solomon H., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Emeth, 556 N. Hoyne Ave.,
Chicago, Ill.
- Bergman, Moise, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Gates of Prayer, 5914 Pitt
St., New Orleans, La.
- Berkowitz, Henry, D. D., Rabbi, Congregation Rodeph Shalom, 1823 N.
33d St., Philadelphia.
- Bernstein, Louis, B. A., Rabbi, Temple Adath Joseph, 1601 Francis St., St.
Joseph, Mo.
- Blatt, Joseph, B. A., Rabbi, Temple B'nai Israel, 1305 Dale Ave., Okla-
homa City, Okla.
- Blau, Joel, B. A., Rabbi, 1438—45th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Blaustein, David, M. A., Superintendent Chicago Hebrew Institute, 1258
Taylor St., Chicago, Ill.
- Bloch, Jacob, M. A., LL. D., Rabbi, 127—14th St., Portland, Ore.
- Blum, A., Rabbi, 138 W. 81st St., New York City.
- Bogen, Joseph, LL. D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 430 E. Baltimore
St., Jackson, Tenn.
- Bottigheimer, Seymour G., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 211
S. Commerce st., Natchez, Miss.
- Braun, Frederick E., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, Lincoln,
Neb.
- Brill, Abram, B. A., Rabbi, Hebrew Union Congregation, 607 Washington
Ave., Greenville, Miss.

- Buttenwieser, Moses, Ph. D., Professor, Hebrew Union College, 3208 Fredonia Ave., Cincinnati, O.
- Calisch, Edward N., B. A., M. A., Ph. D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Ahabah, 406 N. Lombardy St., Richmond, Va.
- Caro, Victor, Rabbi, Congregation B'ne Jeshurun, 237—10th St., Milwaukee, Wis.
- Cohen, Henry, D. D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 1920 Broadway, Galveston, Tex.
- Cohen, Montague N. A., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, Box 654, Butte, Mont.
- Cohen, Simon R., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Elohim, 1383 Dean St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Cohn, Frederick, Ph. D., Rabbi, Congregation Israel, 1302 Park Ave., Omaha, Neb.
- Cronbach, Abraham, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 317 N. Scott St., South Bend, Ind.
- Currick, Max C., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Chesed, 654 W. 8th St., Erie, Pa.
- Deinard, Samuel N., M. A., Ph. D., Rabbi, Congregation Shaare Tov, 513 E. 32d St., Minneapolis, Minn.
- Deutsch, G., Ph. D., Rabbi, Professor, Hebrew Union College, 3600 Wil-son Ave., Cincinnati, O.
- Drucker, Aaron P., Rabbi, 1813 Indiana Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Ehrenreich, Bernard C., Rabbi, Congregation Kahl Montgomery, 58 Sayre St., Montgomery, Ala.
- Elkin, Heiman J., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel, Beaumont, Tex.
- Elkin, Meyer, Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 86 Windsor Ave., Hartford, Conn.
- Ellinger, Emil, Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 1616 Front St., San Diego, Cal.
- Elzas, Barnett A., B. A., M. D., LL. D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Elohim, Charleston Hotel, Charleston, S. C.
- Enelow, H. G., D. D., Rabbi, Congregation Adath Israel, 1670 Willow Ave., Louisville, Ky.
- Englander, Henry, M. A., Ph. D., Rabbi, Congregation Sons of Israel and David, 181 Reynolds Ave., Providence, R. I.
- Ettelson, Harry W., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Achduth Vesholom, 350 W. Berry St., Ft. Wayne, Ind.
- Faber, M., Rabbi, Congregation Bethel, Tyler, Tex.
- Feldman, Ephraim, B. L., B. D., Professor, Hebrew Union College, 3520 Michigan Ave., Hyde Park, O.
- Feuerlicht, Jacob, Rabbi, Superintendent, Home for Jewish Friendless, 53d St. and Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill.

- Feuerlicht, Morris M., B. A., Rabbi, Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation, 2837 Washington Blvd., Indianapolis, Ind.
- Fineshriber, William H., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 217 E. 14th St., Davenport, Ia.
- Fisher, Henry M., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 109 Seaside Ave., Atlantic City, N. J.
- Fleischer, Charles, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Adath Israel, 40 Concord Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
- Foster, Solomon, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 264 Clinton Ave., Newark, N. J.
- Fox, G. George, Ph. B., Rabbi, Beth-El Congregation, Ft. Worth, Tex.
- Frank, Julius, Rabbi, Congregation Oheb Sholom, 36 South 9th St., Reading, Pa.
- Franklin, Leo. M., B. L., Rabbi, Temple Beth-El, 71 Brainard St., Detroit, Mich.
- Freund, Charles J., B. S., B. L., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 524 E. 2nd South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Frey, Sigmund, Rabbi, Superintendent Jewish Orphan Asylum, Los Angeles, Cal.
- Friedlander, Joseph, Rabbi, Hamilton, Ontario.
- Friedlander, M., Rabbi, First Hebrew Congregation, 173 E. Moss Ave., Oakland, Cal.
- Friedman, William S., B. L., LL. D., Rabbi, Temple Emanuel, 1060 Emerson St., Denver, Colo.
- Frisch, Ephraim, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Emeth, 1121 W. 2nd Ave, Pine Bluff, Ark.
- Gerechter, Emanuel, Rabbi, Zion Congregation, 671 Washington St., Appleton, Wis.
- Goldenson, Samuel H., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Emeth, 553 Myrtle Ave., Albany, N. Y.
- Goldstein, Sidney, B. A., Rabbi, Superintendent of Social Service Work, Free Synagogue, 81st St., Columbus and Amsterdam Aves., New York City.
- Gordon, Nathan, M. A., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Emanuel, 68 Stanley St., Montreal, Can.
- Grad, Bennett, B. A., Rabbi, Austin, Tex.
- Greenburg, William H., M. A., Ph. D., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel, 743 S. Ervay St., Dallas, Tex.
- Gries, M. J., B. A., Rabbi, The Temple, 2045 E. 93d St., Cleveland, O.
- Gross, Louis Daniel, M. A., Rabbi, Akron Hebrew Congregation, 194 Beck Ave., Akron, O.
- Grossman, Rudolph, B. L., D. D., Rabbi, Temple Rodeph Shalom, 1347 Lexington Ave., New York City.

- Grossmann, Louis, B. A., D. D., Professor, Hebrew Union College; Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Yeshurun, 2212 Park Ave., W. H., Cincinnati, O.
- Guttmacher, Adolf, Ph. D., Rabbi, Baltimore Hebrew Congregation, 2239 Brookfield Ave., Baltimore, Md.
- Guttman, Adolph, Ph. D., Rabbi, Temple Society of Concord, 102 Walnut Place, Syracuse, N. Y.
- Harris, Maurice H., M. A., Ph. D., Rabbi, Temple Israel of Harlem, 254 W. 103d St., New York City.
- Harrison, Leon, B. A., Ph. D., Rabbi, Temple Israel, 5083 Morgan St., St. Louis, Mo.
- Hausmann, Gustav N., Litt. D., Rabbi, Anshe Chesed Congregation, 76 W. 114th St., New York City.
- Hecht, S., D. D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Brith, 817 Beacon St., Los Angeles, Cal.
- Heller, Maximillian, M. L., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Sinai, 1828 Marengo St., New Orleans, La.
- Hirsch, E. G., Ph. D., D. D., Lt. D., LL. D., Rabbi, Sinai Congregation, 3612 Grand Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
- Hirschberg, Abram, B. A., Rabbi, North Chicago Hebrew Congregation, 177 Lakeview Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Hirshberg, Samuel, M. A., Rabbi Temple Emanu-El, 543 Murray Ave., Milwaukee, Wis.
- Isaacs, A. S., Ph. D., New York University, Washington Sq., New York City.
- Jacobs, Pizer W., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Ahavath Chesed, 1627 Boulevard, Jacksonville, Fla.
- Jacobson, Jacob S., Ph. D., Rabbi, Zion Congregation of West Chicago, 1945 W. Adams St., Chicago, Ill.
- Jacobson, Moses P., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Hebrew Zion, Shreveport, La.
- Jasin, Joseph, B. A., Rabbi, Secretary, Federation of American Zionists, 204 E. Broadway, New York City.
- Jesselson, Felix W., M. A., Rabbi, 109 Ransom St., Grand Rapids, Mich.
- Joseph, Theodore F., B. A., Rabbi, Third St. Temple, Mansion House, Troy, N. Y.
- Kahn, Emanuel, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel, 57 Kellogg St., Grand Rapids, Mich.
- Kaplan, Bernard M., Rabbi, Congregation Ohabei Shalome, 267 Eighth Ave., San Francisco, Cal.
- Kaplan, Jacob H., Ph. D., Rabbi, Congregation Mishkan Israel, 528 Tremont St., Selma, Ala.
- Klein, David, M. A., Rabbi, Petersburg, Va.
- Klein, Israel, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Zion of West Chicago, 1804 Washington Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

- Klein, Jacob, Rabbi, Congregation Or Chodosh, 6938 Harvard Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Koch, Samuel, M. A., Rabbi, Temple de Hirsch, Seattle, Wash.
- Kohler, Kaufman, Ph. D., Rabbi, President, Hebrew Union College, 3016 Stanton Ave., Cincinnati, O.
- Kohut, Geo. A., Ph. D., Rabbi, 781 West End Ave., New York City.
- Kopald, Louis J., M. A., Rabbi, Congregation Ryhim Ahoovim, 420 E. Magnolia St., Stockton, Cal.
- Kornfeld, J. S., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Bene Israel, 366 Linwood Ave., Columbus, O.
- Kory, Sol. L., B. A., Rabbi, Anshe Chesed Congregation, 1112 E. Jackson St., Vicksburg, Miss.
- Krass, Nathan, B. A., LL. D., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Israel, Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Krauskopf, Joseph, D. D., Rabbi, Temple Keneseth Israel, 4715 Pulaski Ave. (Germantown), Philadelphia, Pa.
- Kuppin, Louis, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Sholem, Kahal Kadosh, 1624 York St., Quincy, Ill.
- Landau, Jacob Henry, Rabbi, Congregation Adath Jeshurun, 2320 Tioga St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Landman, Isaac, B. S., Rabbi, Temple Keneseth Israel, 229 Apsley St. (Germantown), Philadelphia, Pa.
- Landsberg, Max, Ph. D., Rabbi, Congregation Berith Kodesh, 420 Main St., East, Rochester, N. Y.
- Lefkovits, Maurice, Ph. D., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel, Box 726, Duluth, Minn.
- Lefkowitz, David, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Yeshurun, 55 Richmond Ave., Dayton, O.
- Leipziger, Emil W., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Temple Israel, 626 Walnut St., Terre Haute, Ind.
- Leiser, Joseph, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Keneseth Israel, 224 S. Madison St., Allentown, Pa.
- Leucht, Joseph, Rabbi emeritus, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 344 High St., Newark, N. J.
- Levi, Charles S., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshai Emeth, National Hotel, Peoria, Ill.
- Levi, Gerson B., M. A., Rabbi, B'nai Shalom Temple Israel, 3612 Grand Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
- Levi, Harry, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Leshem Shomayim, 45 S. Broadway, Wheeling, W. Va.
- Levy, Abraham R., Ph. B., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Abraham, 487 S. Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Levy, Edward S., Rabbi, United Hebrew Congregation, Ft. Smith, Ark.

- Levy, Felix A., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanuel, 1460 Wellington St., Chicago, Ill.
- Levy, J. Leonard, D. D., Rabbi, Congregation Rodeph Shalom, 1526 Deniston Ave., E., Pittsburg, Pa.
- Levy, M. S., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 1225 O'Farrell St., San Francisco, Cal.
- Lewinthal, Isidore, Rabbi, Congregation Ohavai Sholom, 2513 Thompson St., cor. 26th Ave., Nashville, Tenn.
- Liknaitz, David L., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 6th and Osage Sts., Leavenworth, Kan.
- Loewenberg, William, Cantor, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Lovitch, Meyer, B. A., Rabbi, Temple Israel, 1408 Broadway, Paducah, Ky.
- Lowenstein, Solomon C., B. A., Rabbi, Superintendent Hebrew Orphan Asylum, 137th St. and Amsterdam Ave., New York City.
- Lyons, Alexander, B. L., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Elohim, 526—8th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Machol, M., Ph. D., Rabbi emeritus, Congregation Anshe Chesed, 7112 Hough Ave., Cleveland, O.
- Magnes, J. L., Ph. D., Rabbi, Temple Emanuel, 17 Livingston Place, New York City.
- Mannheimer, Eugene, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, Victoria Hotel, Des Moines, Ia.
- Mannheimer, Leo, Ph. D., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 282 Broadway, Paterson, N. J.
- Marcuson, Isaac E., B. L., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 408 Adams St., Sandusky, O.
- Margolis, Elias, Rabbi, New York City.
- Margolis, Max L., Ph. D., Professor in the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1519 Diamond St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Marks, Samuel, Rabbi, Temple Beth El, 114 W. Quincy St., San Antonio, Tex.
- Marx, David, B. L., Rabbi, Congregation Gemilath Chesed, 354 Washington St., Atlanta, Ga.
- Mayer, Eli, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Rodeph Shalom, 2257 N. 17th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Mayer, Harry H., B. A., Rabbi, B'nai Jehudah Congregation, Kansas City, Mo.
- Mendes, F. de Sola, Ph. D., Rabbi, West End Synagogue, 154 W. 2nd St., New York City.
- Mendoza, Louis D., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Ohev Sholom, 3 Raleigh Sq., Norfolk, Va.
- Merritt, Max J., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'ne Israel, 1138 N. 2nd St., Evansville, Ind.

- Messing, Abraham J., Jr., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'rith Sholom, Springfield, Ill., 602 N. Main St., Bloomington, Ill.
- Messing, Aaron J., Ph. D., Rabbi emeritus, Congregation B'nai Sholom Temple Israel, 4848 Prairie Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Messing, Henry J., Rabbi emeritus, United Hebrew Congregation, 5249a Morgan St., St. Louis, Mo.
- Messing, Mayer, Rabbi emeritus, Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation, 523 N. Delaware St., Indianapolis, Ind.
- Meyer, Julius H., B. A., Rabbi, Stock Exchange Bldg., 108 La Salle St., Chicago, Ill.
- Meyer, Martin A., Ph. D., Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El, Hotel Richelieu, San Francisco, Cal.
- Mielziner, Jacob, M. A., Rabbi, Congregation Sheerith Israel-Ahabath Achim, 519 Prospect Place, Cincinnati, O.
- Miller, Julian H., B. A., Rabbi, Mizpah Congregation, 626 McCallie Ave., Chattanooga, Tenn.
- Morgenstern, Julian, Ph. D., Rabbi, Instructor, Hebrew Union College, 3450 Highland Place, Cincinnati, O.
- Moses, Alfred G., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Shaarai Shomayim, Government and Warren Sts., Mobile, Ala.
- Moses, Isaac S., Rabbi, Ahavath Chesed Shaar Hashomayim Congregation, 222 E. 61st St., New York City.
- Neumark, David, Ph. D., Rabbi, Professor, Hebrew Union College, "The Columbia," Winslow Ave., Cincinnati, O.
- Newfield, Morris, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Emanu-El, 2150 S. 16th St., Birmingham, Ala.
- Newman, Julius, Rabbi, Moses Montefiore Congregation, 1112 N. Hoyne Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Nieto, Jacob, Rabbi, Congregation Sherith Israel, 3933 Clay St., San Francisco, Cal.
- Noot, M., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 416 W. Hemlock St., Hazelton, Pa.
- Peiser, Simon, B. A., Rabbi, Assistant Superintendent Jewish Orphan Asylum, Cleveland, O.
- Philipson, David, D. D., Rabbi, Congregation Bene Israel, 3947 Beechwood Ave., Rose Hill, Cincinnati, O.
- Philo, Isadore C., Rabbi, 105 S. Balsch St., Akron, O.
- Raisin, Jacob S., B. A., Rabbi, Montefiore Congregation, 821—11th St., E. Las Vegas, N. Mex.
- Raisin, Max, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 1503—24th Ave., Meridian, Miss.
- Rappaport, Julius, Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 2128 Crystal St., Chicago, Ill.

- Rauch, Joseph, B. A., Rabbi, Mt. Sinai Congregation, Box 287, Sioux City, Ia.
- Reichler, Max, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Shaarei Shamayim, 337 Summit Ave., Schenectady, N. Y.
- Rhine, Abraham, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation House of Israel, 315 West Grand Ave., Hot Springs, Ark.
- Rosenau, William, Ph. D., Rabbi, Congregation Oheb Shalom, 1515 Eutaw Place, Baltimore, Md.
- Rosenbaum, David, Ph. B., Rabbi, Congregation Israel, 50 Division St., Amsterdam, N. Y.
- Rosenthal, Frank L., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 1225—2nd Ave., Columbus, Ga.
- Rosenthal, Isadore, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Shaarai Shomayim, Lancaster, Pa.
- Rosenwasser, Herman, A. M., Rabbi, Temple Sinai, Lake Charles, La.
- Rothstein, Leonard J., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Gemiluth Hassodim, Box 92, Alexandria, La.
- Rubenstein, C. A., B. S., M. A., Rabbi, Congregation Har Sinai, 2313 Callow Ave., Baltimore, Md.
- Rypins, Isaac L., B. L., Rabbi, Mount Zion Hebrew Congregation, 896 Lincoln Ave., St. Paul, Minn.
- Sadler, Bernard, Rabbi, Congregation Covenant of Peace, 909 Jackson St., Easton, Pa.
- Sale, Samuel, Ph. D., Rabbi, Shaareh Emeth Congregation, 4010 W. Bell St., St. Louis, Mo.
- Salzman, Marcus, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai B'rith, 94 W. Ross St., Wilkes Barre, Pa.
- Samfield, Max, Ph. D., Rabbi, Congregation Children of Israel, 218 Adams St., Memphis, Tenn.
- Schanfarber, Tobias, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Mayriv, 4017 Grand Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
- Schlesinger, Max, Ph. D., Rabbi emeritus, Congregation Beth Emeth, 334 Hudson Ave., Albany, N. Y.
- Schloessinger, Max, Ph. D., Rabbi, Hamburg, Germany.
- Schreiber, Emanuel, Ph. D., Rabbi, Hebrew Reform Congregation, York, Pa.
- Schulman, Samuel, D. D., Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 65 E. 92d St., New York City.
- Schwarz, Jacob D., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth-El, 11 N. Spring St., Pensacola, Fla.
- Schwarz, Samuel, T. S. Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, Cleveland, O.
- Sessler, M., Rabbi, Sinai Congregation, 19 Church St., Sumter, S. C.
- Silber, Mendel, B. A., Rabbi, United Hebrew Congregation, 4813 Delmar Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

- Silverman, Joseph, D. D., Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El, 45 E. 75th St., New York City.
- Simon, Abram, Ph. D., Rabbi, Washington Hebrew Congregation, 2802 Cathedral Ave., Washington, D. C.
- Singer, Jacob, M. A., Rabbi, Hebrew Reform Congregation Beth Israel, 146 E. Market St., York, Pa.
- Solomon, George, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Mickve Israel, 1516 Drayton St., Savannah, Ga.
- Spitz, M., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai El, Box 808, St. Louis, Mo.
- Stern, Louis, Rabbi, Washington Hebrew Congregation, 1325—10th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
- Stern, Nathan, Ph. D., Rabbi, 307 W. 93d St., New York City.
- Stolz, Joseph, D. D., Rabbi, Isaiah Temple, 4827 Langley Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Stolz, Joseph Henry, Ph. B., Rabbi.
- Tintner, B., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Yeshurun, New York City.
- Ungerleider, M., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Abraham, 4335 Calumet Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Volmer, Leon, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Yeshurun, 1598 Lee St., Charleston, W. Va.
- Warsaw, Isidore, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Rodef Shalom, Waco, Tex.
- Weinstein, Aaron L., M. A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth El, 626 Poplar St., Helena, Ark.
- Weiss, Harry, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 454 New St., Macon, Ga.
- Willner, Wolff, B. A., M. A., Rabbi, Congregation Adath Jeshurun, 1109 Hamilton St., Houston, Tex.
- Wise, Jonah B., B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, 700 Davis St., Portland, Ore.
- Witt, Louis, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation B'nai Israel, 607 W. 5th St., Little Rock, Ark.
- Wolf, Horace J., M. A., Rabbi, Congregation Ahavath Achim, 7th and Columbia Sts., LaFayette, Ind.
- Wolfenstein, Samuel, Ph. D., Rabbi, Superintendent, Jewish Orphan Asylum, Cleveland, O.
- Wolsey, Louis, B. A., Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Chesed, 1932 E. 116th St., Cleveland, O.
- Yudelson, Albert B., M. D., Rabbi, South Side Hebrew Congregation, 4539 Indiana Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Zepin, George, B. A., Rabbi, Director, Department of Synagogue and School Extension, U. A. H. C., 90 Carew Bldg., 5th & Vine Sts., Cincinnati, O.
- Zielenka, Martin, B. A., Rabbi, Temple Mt. Sinai, Box 756, El Paso, Tex.

PUBLICATIONS.

- Union Prayer Book, Volumes I and II.
Sabbath Evening and Morning Service.
Week Day Service.
Service for House of Mourning.
Evening Service for Week Day and Sabbath (For Field Secretary's Use).
Union Hymnal.
*Year Books, Volumes I to XIX.
*Index of Year Books.
The Union Haggadah for Passover Eve.
*Set of Holiday Sermons.
Sermons by American Rabbis.
*Views on the Synod.

REPRINTS.

- *Aspects of Theology of Reformed Judaism, by Prof. Max L. Margolis.
*Rashi, by Prof. M. Schloessinger.
*The Sabbath Commission, by Dr. J. Voorsanger.
*Assyriology in the Bible, by Dr. K. Kohler.
*Report of Committee on Relation between Rabbi and Congregation, by Dr. D. Philipson.
*Funeral Agenda, by Dr. Joseph Stolz.
*Gabriel Riesser, by Prof. G. Deutsch.
*Samuel Holdheim, by Dr. David Philipson.
*A Plan for Co-operative Work in Collecting Material for Encyclopedic Studies in Jewish History and Literature and Supplementary Explanations, by Prof. G. Deutsch.
*Reform Movement as Reflected in Neo-Hebraic Literature, by Rabbi Max Raisin.

*Why the Bible Should not be Read in the Public Schools, by Committee on Church and State.

*The Origin and Function of Ceremonies in Judaism, by Dr. K. Kohler.

*Moses Hayyim Luzzatto, by Rabbi Isaac Landman.

*Samson Raphael Hirsch, by Rabbi Max Heller.

*The Significance of the Bible for Reform Judaism in the Light of Modern Scientific Research, by Dr. Julian Morgenstern.

*Crescas and Spinoza, by Prof. David Neumark.

TRACTS.

*I. What Do Jews Believe? by Dr. H. G. Enelow.

*II. The Jew in America, by Dr. David Philipson.

(Those publications marked (*) may be obtained free of charge upon application to the Corresponding Secretary.)

*TRAVELING LIBRARY OF THE COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND STATE.

(Applications for the use of this Library should be addressed to the Chairman, Rabbi Wm. S. Friedman, Ll. D.)

1. Bible in the Public Schools, The—Account of the Minor Case against the Cincinnati Board of Education.
2. Moral Education, by Edw. Howard Griggs.
3. Moral Instruction of Children, The, by Felix Adler.
4. Religious Freedom in American Education, by Jos. Henry Crooke.
5. Religious Liberty in the United States, by Oscar S. Straus.
6. Roger Williams, the Pioneer of Religious Liberty, by Oscar S. Straus.
7. Reply to Justice Brewer, by Isaac Hassler.

The Bloch Publishing Co., 40 E. 14th St., New York
City, has exclusive charge of the sale of the Publica-
tions of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.







BM
30
C4
v.19

Central Conference of Ameri-
can Rabbis
Yearbook

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
